THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, D.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant,
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XIX AUGUST, 1929 No. 110

EDITORIAL

THE DARK NIGHT OF THE CHURCH

It may be doubted whether the outlook for the Church of England was ever more dark, or its condition more insupportable to all true believers in the Christian faith, than it is today. A century ago Keble and his friends were confronted with a relatively clear issue; the nation had apostatized from Christianity through its alliance with the new Liberalism, and the Church must awake to the reality of its vocation and emphasize its distinctness from the world. Today the spirit of apostasy is going to work by far subtler methods. It is not the nation but the Church itself which is to be false to the Gospel of Christ. Not by open attack, but by flattery; not by burning down Bishops' palaces, but by filling them with men who can be trusted to deny the faith they promised to defend; not by threats of disestablishment, but by the firmer establishment of heresy in the high offices of the Church:—it is thus that today the citadel of English religion is being undermined.

The facts are becoming familiar enough; but they have been thrust home into the minds of English Churchmen with redoubled force in recent months. Thus, on June 9, the Bishop of Birmingham preached a sermon in Westminster Abbey, intended to discredit, not miracles only, but the whole historical basis of Christianity as presented in the Gospels, and implying that there were no definite beliefs to which a minister of the Gospel need consider himself committed. Within the same month the same pulpit of Westminster Abbey provided Canon Charles, Archdeacon of Westminster, with the occasion for an even more direct attack upon the faith embodied in the creeds. This time it was belief in the Resurrection which was to be trampled underfoot. Christ's "mere physical body," he said,

"had, as the narratives of Resurrection showed, when tested critically, historically, and metaphysically, no essential relation, nor indeed a relation of any kind, with the spirit after death. . . . The adjournment of the Resurrection for three days and three nights, but really for two nights and a day and a half, or thereabouts, was simply due to the utter spiritual incapacity of the Apostles to recognize sooner than the second day the spiritual risen Christ. . . . To regard Christ as a mutilated personality, even for a moment after His death on the Cross, was a gross misconception—a misinterpretation—which had no other support than that which it derived from the legend of the empty tomb."

"*The legend of the empty tomb*"—so that is what the Modernist of today holds himself entitled to preach, while still retaining his orders, and reciting the creeds, and drawing the emoluments of his office! It is true that the Bishop of Birmingham's sermon elicited a courageous rebuke soon afterwards from Canon Carnegie in St. Margaret's, Westminster; but it was quickly overwhelmed by the studied effronteries of Canon Charles. Nor have we any reason to suppose that these sermons are other than part of a well-considered policy. The headlines of the sensationalist press have encouraged Modernists to suppose that the public is behind them in their campaign. The public does not want disestablishment, nor does it want a Church too strong in the faith: a Church torn by dissensions within, and untrammelled by any awkward fidelities, is far more likely to be pliable and obsequious to the popular whim. It is no accident that the leading Modernists scarcely find any place in their vocabulary for sin: that is part and parcel of the rôle of the Court Chaplains to King Demos.

The result, both direct and indirect, of the present campaign of heresy is disastrous. Its direct effect is simply to strengthen the hands of unbelief. The Bishop of Birmingham is pleased, in his Olympian fashion, to say that in his judgment "public worship has a peculiar value": but it is hard to see why the ordinary man should agree with him, when there is such vagueness as to the faith on which worship rests. There is nothing which so much pleases the secularist and the pleasure-lover as utterances like those of Dr. Barnes and Dr. Charles. He argues that Christianity, according to the statements of high dignitaries of the Church, is played out: they may see good

reason for retaining a connexion with the Church which is evidently very lucrative: but, for himself, he sees no reason why he should interest himself for a moment in a Church whose formularies are obsolete, whose creed is shattered, and whose Gospel has lost all contact with the supernatural. For every one, it is safe to say, who may be influenced towards religion by hearing or reading what Dr. Barnes or Dr. Charles says, there are ten or twenty who are simply hardened by it in their indifference or unbelief.

And the indirect result is not less serious. The repeated attacks of Modernists on the faith are inducing in the public mind a settled contempt—the phrase is not too strong—for clerical veracity. When leaders of the Church, enjoying the favour of the Crown, controlling the most influential pulpits, and reaping all the emoluments of office, freely and without rebuke deny primary doctrines of Christianity which they were pledged at their baptism to believe and promised at their ordination to preach and to teach; when they do this without any serious attempt to face the arguments of orthodoxy, but appeal, not to Scripture, not to the Fathers, not to the testimony of the saints throughout the ages, not even to reason, but simply to popular notions of what "science" is saying—or was saying a generation ago; when they do this without a suggestion that any question of moral integrity and intellectual honesty arises:—then what can prevent the public forming the conviction that in the Church of England the profession of faith, even in solemn moments and under solemn oaths, is no more than a form of words which has no relation to the intention of the heart? It cannot, of course, be supposed that Modernists themselves are troubled about any such issue: the scruples that tortured a Maurice or a Hort, a Tennyson or a Clough or a Thomas Arnold, are for them no more than the relics of a *démodé* Victorianism. But there are still, we believe, some considering men, not least among the laity, who realize that nothing could strike a more deadly blow at the moral influence of the Church than the conviction, borne in upon them by evidence too palpable to gainsay, that clerical subscription was nothing more than an empty farce.

The question remains, What can be done? We hope that, by the time this number appears, something may have been done in Convocation to make clear to the Bishops and to the world outside what is the view of the clergy. For our own part, we are convinced that the Bishops cannot hope to

secure assent to the 1928 Book or to any other, unless and until they have by some formal act of repudiation cleared themselves, and the Church of which they are the guardians, of complicity in the Modernist movement. Who can for a moment set the *minutiæ* of ritual, or the exact details of Reservation, in the balance against the maintenance of the Gospel itself? Why should we fiddle, while the citadel of the faith is burning, and the perpetrators of the arson go at large? It is they, most of all, who are the real disturbers of the Church's peace; and to cry "Peace," while they are still left at their deadly work, would be the height of insincerity and treason.

But a protest in Convocation—even a protest by the whole bench of Bishops—would not remedy the evil: the crisis calls for more radical and enduring methods. Various policies present themselves. One is disestablishment, which has lately enlisted the eloquent pen of the Bishop of Durham. He has based his claim for it on two grounds—the rejection of the Prayer Book, and the anomalies of the divorce law. The unblushing assaults of Modernism might well provide him with a third ground, and perhaps the strongest of all. But there are obvious difficulties. The civil power shows at present no inclination to disestablish the Church; and, if it did, how would it be done? We have no guarantee whatever that any precedent would be followed. The State could part with patronage in Ireland or in Wales without parting with anything which was of much value to itself: but would the same be true of England? We do not think so. We cannot conceive that the State would part with the right to appoint to at least the more important both of its bishoprics and of its pulpits. Leading clergymen who can be relied on to say what is popular at the moment are too great an asset for the Government of a nation to part with. Did not Cæsar have his Augustales? For an imperial people to part with those it has would be folly indeed.

Another policy is suggested along the lines of a revision of the Enabling Act in the direction of further self-government for the Church. Similar efforts to such an end were made in the Church of Scotland prior to the great Disruption of 1843, but were unavailing. In this country a new Enabling Act would have to include the reform of Crown patronage, the complete removal of matters of faith and worship from the purview of Parliament, and the establishment of an effective system of ecclesiastical courts. With such courts functioning, it should

be possible to treat deliberate and controversial aberrations of doctrine as the grave scandals that they are, and to ensure that they were punished even more severely than irregularities of ritual. It is arguable that a just system of discipline in the Church would not only restore confidence within the Church, but also appeal to the British people's instincts of fairness sufficiently to secure the support of Parliament. After the Prayer Book debates in the House of Commons, we confess we are not hopeful of any so judicial a solution, though, of course, the general election may have changed the atmosphere in the House on these matters, as it has certainly changed its personnel.

But, if neither of these courses offers a remedy, then what can be done? The answer is clear. There must be a firm and deliberate policy of separation organized within the Church itself. It should take its stand simply and solely on the maintenance of the faith as taught in Scripture and the creeds. Its line of demarcation would at once embrace and cut across existing lines of party cleavage; for the Central and Evangelical schools of thought are in the main no less orthodox than Anglo-Catholics. Provided its basis were made clear, a large proportion of diocesan Bishops might be expected to embrace such a movement and be its natural leaders. And it should be made plain at the outset that the purpose of this movement was either to purge the Church of its apostasy *or to secede*. The fact must be frankly faced that secession may in the long run be necessary; nor would it be the first time that secession had been the only way to save the Church from herself. All would depend, however, on the thoroughness with which the ground was prepared. In the eighteenth century, the secession of the Non-Jurors failed, because it took place on too narrow an issue. In the nineteenth century, on the other hand, the secession of Chalmers and his friends was a triumphant success, because its platform was broad and the movement was well considered beforehand. And in England today, what broader platform could we have than the Catholic Faith and the maintenance of clerical honesty? We do not doubt that nine-tenths of the clergy and of the church-going public would be behind such a movement, whether or not they joined it personally; and we might confidently expect that, as in Scotland, so in England, the spectacle of men in earnest for their faith would in due course bring the public to see that the Church of Christ was one of the things in this world that its patronage could not buy.

THE SOUTH INDIA PROPOSALS

No one can undertake the task of criticizing the South India proposals without a certain reluctance, and a grave sense of responsibility.

On the one hand, it is so fatally easy to sit in an arm-chair and pass judgment upon movements at which we are looking from a distance.

On the other hand, when the movement in question is a new venture in Christian brotherhood; when from those who are bearing the burden of missionary work in non-Christian countries we hear of the sense of intolerable strain which disunion brings, and of the unreality to native Christians of divisions which they did not create and do not desire to perpetuate; when we understand that there is real danger, if Indian Christians of different denominations remain out of communion with each other, of establishing the caste-system in a new form—then our glib criticisms are silenced.

There is a sense in which we at home are unworthy to receive and consider these proposals. For we are all too prone to put sectional loyalties before our loyalty to the trust committed to us by God in the Anglican Communion. We are, moreover, still beset by "the trappings and wrappings of Anglicanism," unable to rise above the national elements in it, and very prone to take shelter in our favourite rabbit-holes instead of looking up to the wide expanses of heaven.

We are invited to share in a consideration of a new venture in Christian brotherhood in which our own Church is concerned. We have no right to criticize it except in the interests of a wider brotherhood still. The scheme stands or falls by whether in the long run it promotes or hinders that brotherhood of all men in Christ which shall be strong enough to heal the differences due to sin, wilfulness, ignorance and misunderstanding between groups of Christians, classes, nations and races; and strong enough to transcend the lesser loyalties formed by affinities of religious outlook, class, nation or race.

The suggestion in recent discussions of the South India proposals that criticism of the scheme has narrowed itself down to such a fine point that it can be swept aside as so much ecclesiastical *finesse*, can hardly be maintained in view of the publication of the Proposed Scheme of Union in its latest form. We must get behind negotiations to principles. Efforts towards Reunion inevitably crystallize themselves into formulæ: and such formulæ often cover up or avoid the real issues at stake.

Gibbon, for example, was perfectly correct in saying that the theological controversies of the fifth century turned upon an *iota*. But if by that he intended to imply that they were trivial and that no great principles were involved, he was merely revealing his own blindness as to the reality of those principles.

The great schism between East and West affords another example. It was finally declared to turn on whether the word *filioque* should or should not be included in the Creed, and whether leavened or unleavened bread should be used at the Eucharist. But behind these "fine points" there lay vast differences and divergences bound up with questions of ecclesiastical authority, the relation of National Churches to the Church Universal, temperamental misunderstandings, racial, political, and commercial animosities, which had gradually aggravated the breach between the two Churches for 670 years before formal schism took place.

Yet again, the present situation in international affairs is illuminating. While, on the one hand, such education of the peoples for world peace as is going on is steadily and very slowly bearing fruit in stronger public opinion, on the other, the work of Conferences and Pacts seems to be resulting in an international situation actually more dangerous than that of 1914.

Applying these considerations to the South India proposals, I venture to suggest that to assume that the difficulty turns on any one point—as, for example, the position of some ministers during the period of thirty years before the scheme takes full effect—is misleading and likely to be fruitful of rancour. It is more valuable to consider general principles with constant reference to their bearing upon details of the South India Scheme.

Take, for example, this difficulty about allowing non-episcopally ordained ministers during the interim period. We must in truth and charity face the prior question, Why does this difficulty arise? It arises because there are two conceptions of the ministry—not, I hope, finally irreconcilable, but very different—at stake.

The late Bishop of Bombay said at Lausanne: "The differences of our conceptions [of the ministry] appear most plainly when we try to answer the question, 'What happens at ordination?' To that question the Churches which have preserved the traditional form of the ministry of Holy Orders answer: 'It is Christ who consecrates or ordains, and in consecration or ordination He, using the bishop as His mouthpiece, makes a man a bishop, or a priest, or a deacon,' or a member of any other order to which admission is believed to be given by ordination. The Protestant Churches . . . answer, generally,

that 'ordination is a corporate recognition of the grace-gift investing with the authority of the Church the exercise of that gift within the Christian community.' In other words, some of us say: 'In ordination Christ ordains'; others say: 'In ordination the Church recognizes and authorizes.'"*

Turning to the South India proposals, the statement of the doctrine and functions of the ministry, on page 4 of the Scheme, is a splendid attempt to combine the truth in both these views. It cannot be said to be contradictory to the mind and intention of the Anglican ordinal.

And yet, owing to phrases which occur in other parts of the Scheme, there are questions about which we should ask for further light.

Is that element in episcopacy which bears witness to the fact that the Church is not a democratic but a theocratic body adequately safeguarded? The right of Bishops to canonical obedience and their *ius liturgicum* seem to be seriously curtailed.

Again, there is no mention in the duties of the presbyterate (enumerated, pp. 23-24) of the ministry of absolution. Is this intentional?

Again, it is not clear whether Ordination is into the Church of God or into the Church of South India.

On all these points there is sufficient ambiguity in the actual wording of the proposals to raise doubts as to whether the implications of the theories of ministry have been thoroughly understood.

And behind these different conceptions of ministry there are different conceptions of the Church. The tendency of Protestant thought is to maintain that Church-hood is fulfilled in a gathering of believers met in Christ's name, the order and organization of the gathering being secondary: the tendency of the historic Churches is to maintain that Holy Order is as vital to Church-hood as the central nervous system is to human personality.

The need of Holy Order is, up to a point, generously recognized in the proposals. But there is ambiguity in the use both of the word *Church* and of the word *Communion*.

When we speak of *Churches* and *the Church* we may mean one of two things. Either that local, regional, national Churches are parts of the Universal Church in the sense of local manifestations and representatives of one outward and visible Church, in communion with other local Churches and expected to conform to the principles and customs of the Church Universal: or, that rival Christian bodies each claiming Church-hood and each separately claiming to define what they mean by Church-

* *Official Report of Lausanne*, pp. 236-7.

hood, not in communion with each other in the sense that interchange of ministry and communicants goes without saying and does not require authorization because there is no difference of principle or intention or custom at stake,—that such bodies somehow together make up the Church—which in this case is not outward and visible, but invisible.

There is a fundamental principle at stake here. "The unity of the Church is not an afterthought brought about by a deliberate process of confederation on the part of a number of independent Churches."*

A series of most curious phrases in the South India proposals suggests that this fundamental principle has not been fully faced.† It must suffice to quote one: "The united Church will seek to be in full communion with the Churches of the Anglican Communion, and equally to be in such relations of communion and fellowship with other Churches as are now maintained with those Churches by the South India United Church and the Wesleyan Church of South India."

Both the word *Church* and the word *Communion* are used ambiguously here. It is not clear whether to be in communion means "in organic communion" in the sense defined above, or "in relations of Christian charity."

It would be possible to demonstrate that behind these ideas of Church-hood are implied different conceptions of authority, a different view of the relation of nature to supernature, of special sacraments to the sacramental principle, and quite possibly a different view of the relation between the Incarnation of God and the Immanence of God.

These issues are inevitably involved in any scheme of Reunion between the Anglican Communion and Nonconformist bodies.

It is no doubt easy to say that the Anglican Communion as we know it stands for nothing definable in heaven or earth, and that we therefore cannot be said to have any principles distinctive from those of Rome on the one side, or the Free Churches on the other, for which to stand. But that assertion is surely a mischievous half-truth.

It was recognized by many at Lausanne that the Anglican Communion was neither Roman, Eastern nor Protestant, but represented a fourth group.

In the words of a recent writer: "The present English Church is in continuity with the Church of the ages, besides being a Reformed Church, and conversely it is a Reformed Church

* Hobhouse, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 357.

† Such phrases occur on pages 9 and 10 of the Foreword, and pages 1, 2, 8, and 12 of the Proposals.

as well as being in continuity with the Church of the ages."* As Bishop Stubbs said, "the Reformed character of the English Church is the complement of its Catholic history."

It looks backwards and forwards: backwards to the glory of the Catholicism of the past, and forwards to the Catholicity that is in Christ.

The Christian world is confronted with at least three admittedly enormous problems:

1. The relation of the Catholic to the Protestant outlook.
2. An antinomy of thought equally if not more far-reaching, but not quite so easily labelled. Some would call it Fundamentalist and Modern, but those terms are highly unsatisfactory.
3. The problem of the relation of nationalism to the Kingdom of God.

1. If the Catholic and Protestant points of view are fundamentally irreconcilable and represent utterly opposite conceptions of Christianity, we are involved in a contradiction in terms. For Christianity is Christ, and Christ cannot be opposed to Himself. We are driven to say that either the Catholic conception of religion or the Protestant is not Christian at all; or, putting it concretely, to assert either that Baron von Hügel or that David Livingstone was not a Christian. That assertion, I, for one, am not prepared to make. I am therefore, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, bound to believe and act as though I believed that the Catholic and Protestant points of view are reconcilable in Christ. And I am content to be in the company of such solid thinkers as Canon Quick, Professor Turner and Bishop Gore in my belief.

2. Whether we like the terms Fundamentalist and Modern or not, there is before us as Christians a choice between two different attitudes to our Faith. The one attitude tends to maintain that the essence of the Christian revelation has been infallibly and irreformably expressed once for all in documents, whether the text of Scripture or in a finally and authoritatively complete catena of doctrine pronounced as *de fide* by the Vatican. The other attitude tends to claim that in Christ, who came and taught, acted and died and rose, and in Him alone is revealed and expressed the finality and once-for-all-ness of God: and that though we should strive to describe accurately and to standardize in words what we mean by our Faith in one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and to ignore or underestimate the authority enshrined in the Bible, the Creeds, and the most representative decisions of the Church, is folly, yet in the last resort it is im-

* J. W. Poynter, in the *Modern Churchman*, January, 1929.

possible to systematize a Person, least of all is it possible to systematize Christ. The most that any system can claim is that it comes nearer than others in its attempt to embody the whole truth as it is in Christ.

3. Nationalism. It seems to be God's way that men should live in Nations. Nationality is a great gift. But Nationalism has done untold harm in Christian history, and is doing untold harm in the world to-day. National aspiration is good and cannot be eradicated, but unless it is redeemed through a supra-national brotherhood in Christ, woe betide the world.

I must apologize for this digression, but it seems necessary to reconvince ourselves that in relation to these three problems the Anglican Communion is increasingly recognized to have been given *a unique trust*. In its character as Catholic but reformed, in its freedom from obsession about fundamentalist infallibilities, and in its belief both in the one Catholic Church and in national Churches—in its adherence to Ordered Liberty, free from ultra-montanism on the one hand and separatism on the other—it is a distinctive instrument in the hands of God. It is therefore quite vital to the whole world to maintain the integrity of the Anglican Communion and to take no action which would impair that integrity.

If this is true, then we must bravely shoulder the distinctive responsibility laid upon us by God.

There is something timid and apologetic in the temper which says that we must not take any step which will minimize our chances of Reunion with Rome or Eastern Christendom on the one side, or with the Protestant bodies on the other. We must take infinite and costly pains to understand their point of view and avoid hasty and ill-formed judgments. But primarily and fundamentally nothing matters for the Anglican Communion except that it should respond to the whole and distinctive purpose of God for it. If first and foremost it will respond and boldly take the lead in continuing to respond to the Truth as it is in Christ, others, be it late or be it soon, will follow that Truth. That is to say, if the Anglican Communion is to continue to take its stand on the principle of Ordered Liberty, it must do so because it believes in this principle as according to the mind of Christ, and not upset the balance for any secondary reason; as for example, by stressing Liberty and ignoring Order, for the sake of reunion with the Free Churches, or stressing Order and ignoring Liberty in the interests of reunion with Rome and the East.

Whatever view is taken of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, it is clear in the mind of the Anglican Church, which has created one hundred and twenty-two missionary dioceses in

one hundred years, that the historic Episcopate is intended to be an outward and visible sign both of the inward continuity of the Church in a world of change and of the transcendent element in Christ's authority in a world in which democracy and nationalism seem to lead people into corporate self-pleasing. The Scheme before us speaks of the united Church as intending "to be careful not to allow any overriding of conscience by Church authorities." This and other statements make one doubtful whether this transcendent element in authority is adequately allowed for.

Again, whatever our views of Sacramental Doctrine, it is at least clear in the mind of the Anglican Communion not only that the two Sacraments of the Gospel are means of grace in quite a special sense, but that Confirmation is organically associated with Baptism in a way that makes it very difficult if not impossible to treat it as if it did not stand or fall with Baptism.

The Scheme leaves the question of Confirmation over for the decision of the Synod of the United Church if and when it comes into being, and until the question is settled, "either the rite of Confirmation administered by a bishop of the Church, or such a service of admission to full membership as was in use in the South India United Church before the union, or such a service for the recognition of new members as was in use in the Wesleyan Church in South India before the union, shall be employed in admitting persons to full or communicant membership of the United Church."*

It seems as though those who have been thinking and praying out the South India Scheme have reached, without fully facing the principles at stake behind traditionally divergent views of the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments, a plan which with careful education and mutual goodwill might prove to be locally workable.

It is frankly claimed as a local scheme. "The scheme," says the report, "has been drawn up definitely for South India, and in view of the particular circumstances of the Church in South India."†

No doubt such a scheme must begin somewhere, but it is as impossible to solve the problem of disunion in isolation as it is to solve that of economics or industry or war and peace.

We talk quite rightly of the economic and industrial interdependence of the whole world, and say that what occurs in Manchester or Osaka affects Bombay and New York. But what is true in the economic sphere is just as true and more so in the intellectual and religious sphere. "The lead being

* Page 17. † Page viii.

given by South India is being eagerly followed in Persia. It would certainly be followed, perhaps with increased mistakes, in China : and there could be no doubt that it would spread to parts of Africa" (Gore).

It is in its relations with the great Christian world outside that the plan seems in danger of breaking down. In spite of the earnest desire of the promoters of the scheme to maintain and increase fellowship with those beyond their borders, the scheme as proposed is an application of the principle *Cuius regio eius religio* to the southern half of India. That principle was devised at Augsburg in the middle of the sixteenth century in order to get round the difficulty that some principalities in Germany were predominantly Catholic and others predominantly Protestant. It was embodied in England in our Acts of Uniformity. History has shown it to be a principle which needs cautious application.* Its temporary success in Protestant countries depended upon—(1) The close association of the regional Church with the State (it is hardly necessary to state there will be no State-connexion in the proposed United Church of South India); (2) a condition of isolation between State and State, and one regional Church and another, which is utterly and wholly unlike that of the modern world. The effect of this principle upon the Reformed Churches was inevitably to make them utterly un-missionary (they were dominated by the idea of one religion for one region, another for another), and it was not until the principle was rejected by the acceptance of toleration that the missionary work of the Reformed Churches could begin.

The present application of the principle to South India makes for strange inconsistencies. It involves the attempt to be a completely "autonomous Church, free from any control, legal or otherwise, of any Church or Society external to itself,"† whose Synod is the final authority in all matters pertaining to that Church,‡ and a province of the Anglican Communion in India at one and the same time.

And the attempt to be in full communion with the Churches of the Anglican Communion, and equally to be in such relations of communion and fellowship with Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Wesleyans outside the area of the scheme, creates an impossible position, unless and until the Anglican Communion is in organic union with these bodies in regions other than South India. An Anglican either could not sign the Basis of

* For an exposition of the sound element in this principle, see "The Nature and Value of National or Regional Churches," by E. J. Palmer, D.D., *The East and the West*, January, 1926.

† Page 7. ‡ Page 32.

Union at all, or if he did would be bound in conscience to act in England as in full communion with bodies with which his own Church is not in full communion.

The danger seems to be lest the forces which are moulding this union are those of enthusiasm for an indigenous Christianity which is impatient of its responsibility to the whole Catholic Brotherhood. But the way still lies open for amendments to a scheme which, while it rightly asserts the claims of a region which is homogeneous in culture to a large measure of autonomy as a "particular Church," shows signs of unwillingness to accept any longer the discipline of difference in order that in God's good time we may be given a union which shall be union indeed.

E. R. MORGAN.

THE INCARNATION—II.

III

WE urged last month that within the pages of the New Testament itself all the constituents of later Christology are to be found. The life of the early community reveals a complex religious experience centred in Jesus Christ; this experience is formulated in phrases which are revelational in form, such as "Thou art the Christ," "My Lord and my God," "Jesus is Lord"; and these revelations or rudimentary dogma-materials are the subject of theological thought and interpretation along both historical and philosophical (or at least cosmical) lines. I could wish that time permitted me to trace this double process of development more fully;—on the one hand, to show that the Jesus portrayed in the Gospels presents us with the lineaments of such a Personality as we should need to find in One whom we were to believe to be very God Incarnate; on the other, to justify the term "philosophy" as applied to a tradition of Jewish thought which plays a large part in the thought of St. Paul and St. John. This is not possible, however, within the compass of this paper; and what remains will be devoted to a brief consideration of the orthodox dogma of the Incarnation and its relation to the thought of today.

The point which I wish especially to urge is that we should recognize in this dogma—in the formula of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), for example—a symbolic or schematic element. Throughout the second and third centuries we can watch Catholic theology at its work of conserving and explaining the central revelation or *depositum fidei* inherited from the Apostolic Church—a living

experience of God in Christ expressed in terms predominantly Jewish. The first danger came from Gnosticism, and in that conflict it was on the dogma of the Creation rather than of the Incarnation that the defensive front was formed. But, as Christianity more and more established itself in the Gentile world, and claimed the attention (not least through the labours of the Alexandrian scholars) of intellectual circles, it was inevitable that theologians should be forced to a more explicit formulation of what the Church believed about Christ. Baptismal creeds were already in use, containing the primary facts of the new religion; and even here—as when it is said that the eternal Son "came down from heaven"—symbolism of a quite simple and obvious kind has to be employed. A further stage, however, is reached when we come to the *Homo-ousios* of the Arian controversy; and it behoves us to try and understand what has happened.

What has happened is that Christian theology has for the first time formally laid hold upon a technical term of current philosophy in order to conserve and explain its central experience. The occasion was the necessity of repudiating the Arian error; but the occasion would not have arisen, if Christianity had not by this time been moving in the kind of *milieu* where such language was employed. The Church was compelled now, that is to say, to relate that part of its experience which was concerned especially with Christ to those other fields of experience which were the subject-matter of the science and philosophy of that day. The advance was not one to be regretted: it was forced upon the Church by the inner vitality of its own progress; to have refused to take it would have been to adopt the sectarian policy of regarding secular knowledge as indifferent to true religion; a Church that was truly Catholic, and claimed the allegiance of mind no less than heart and will, could not hold back. At the same time, if it did not hold back, it was bound to use the categories of thought current at the time.

In what sense, however, is the dogma of the Incarnation—the *Homo-ousios*, the doctrine of the Two Natures, the relation of the Son to the Father, and so on—final and irreformable? Is it an absolute experience of truth, such that it can form for all time the starting-place for theological deduction? Or does it contain a relative element, which needs to be distinguished and borne in mind in all study of the subject? If there is any force in the line of argument adopted in this paper, we are bound to answer this last question in the affirmative. We are bound, that is to say, to claim that the terms of the *Quicumque vult*, for example, or of the Chalcedonian Definition, are relative to the particular type of Greek philosophy—a form

of Platonism—which was dominant in the thought of the patristic age. That is what is meant when we speak of the dogma containing a schematic element. It presupposes a *schema* or system of philosophy in the terms of which it is expressed, and to which it refers. In relation to that system of thought, the dogma is final and irreformable. It conserved and interpreted, that is to say, the Church's experience of God in Christ, and did so in the only terms which were then to hand for the purpose. Any other doctrinal expressions of the same truth must serve the like function of conserving and transmitting the experience; in seeking for such expression theology will inevitably be guided at every step by the formulations of the past: but there is no *a priori* reason why what has once been done by the Church in relation to one philosophy should not be done again, if necessary, in relation to another. Athanasius met the Modernism of his day, not by drawing back into more primitive formulations of the faith, but by going forward to a bolder affirmation than Arius ever adventured.

The case might be summed up by saying that the patristic dogma is final in content—*i.e.*, the Godhead of Christ—but not final in expression. So far as its terms are concerned, moreover, some parts of it have more finality than others. Dr. Gore has pointed out, for instance, that it is difficult to conceive any category more ultimate than that of *οὐσία* or Being, or to see how theology could ever dispense with it. The contention is both true and important. The *Homo-ousios* doctrine represents a permanent witness against both the Ritschlianism which would restrict the Christian faith to judgments of value only, and the Modernism which (like that of Dr. Bethune-Baker) would draw back from all metaphysical commitments whatsoever, substituting a Jesus-cult for a Christology. At the same time, we need a caution; for in modern thought "substance"—by which *οὐσία* is translated in our Creeds—has no longer the meaning that it had, and "being" or "level of reality" would be a better translation. The case is even more marked when we pass to other terms used in the dogma—particularly those which concern the union of the Two Natures in Christ. Here the meanings of the terms changed actually within the patristic period itself, *natura*, *substantia*, *persona*, *ὑπόστασις*, *οὐσία* being used with bewildering variety. Broadly speaking, it is true that there is never any doubt as to what the orthodox Fathers are trying to say; but there is also never any certainty as to how they will say it. We are dealing throughout with a final revelation: but it is not the case that there is a revealed theology.

We are thus in a position to lay down with some confidence

the conditions necessary for a restatement of the doctrine of the Incarnation. It must conserve and explain the central experience of life in Christ which is the distinctive genius of Christianity; it must do this, not by a process of explicitation and deduction within the categories and terms of earlier formulations—until the orange is squeezed quite dry—but rather by seeking to relate the faith to contemporary knowledge and to explain it in the terms of that knowledge. It is arguable that in any age the dominant philosophy is so closely allied to that of the Fathers that the old theology will serve with but little change: such was the case with the scholasticism of the Middle Ages. Or again, there may be times when it is impossible to say that there is any philosophical system which can claim general acceptance: such, I suppose, was the position of European thought in the nineteenth century. But it does not follow that it is the same today; and there is not a little to be said for the view that Western thought is in fact being increasingly dominated by certain conceptions which bid fair to provide a systematic and synthetic philosophy applicable in all fields of knowledge. The names of Eddington, Whitehead, Alexander, Lloyd Morgan, General Smuts, Dr. Temple, and M. Le Roy are at least a guarantee that any common principles underlying their work demand a more than ordinary respect; and a Christology which, like that of Fr. Thornton of Mirfield, assumes such a philosophical background is one that cannot be dismissed as simply an individual *tour-de-force*.* What Fr. Thornton has done is to give us a Christology which is not only drawn in terms of this philosophy, but also provides the key to much in it that was otherwise unrelated or obscure. I do not mean that Fr. Thornton is easy to read; indeed, I must confess that there are parts of his book which are beyond me and will perhaps remain so. But I can understand enough to know that here there is profound teaching about God, the world, and man, which will repay repeated study and yield up at every reading some fresh access to the Christ.

The conception of the universe underlying Fr. Thornton's Christology is that associated with such scientists as Dr. Eddington and Dr. Whitehead. It might almost be described as a Cambridge Platonism; for Cambridge is its home, and its metaphysic (like Plato's) arises out of mathematics and science. The physical groundwork of reality, for this philosophy, is a "field of repetitive energy" on which creative activity is perpetually weaving new patterns, as it brings the organic series of the universe into being. Fr. Thornton expands this

* The following description of Fr. Thornton's main theme is quoted from the present writer's review of the book in *The Review of the Churches* for April, 1929.

theme into what is no less than a comprehensive doctrine of Creation, magnificent in its compass and searching in its analysis. Modern science reveals in the universe an ascending series of organisms, each lower level being taken up into that above it, and being transformed and made answerable to a new pattern, as it comes under a new principle of unity. This principle of unity is for each organism the highest law of its being. At the head of the ascending series stands man, who belongs to the level of spirit and has kinship with the eternal order. But man's highest law of being is that of freedom through self-transcendence; and that principle, so deeply attested by his experience of non-attainment, marks him out as "a stranger in the place of his origin."

At every point of this creative process there is an incorporation into it of the eternal order; and this involves Revelation. It is apprehended first in the "directive movement" of the universe, and at a later stage, as pre-eminently by the Prophets of Israel, in the historical march of events. Man is heir to a yet higher order of revelation, which Fr. Thornton styles "infinite," and which accounts for his recognition of the absolute value of Goodness, Truth, and Beauty. Finally, there is that order of revelation which is specifically religious; and in this order God is manifested as Absolute Actuality, Himself the source and content of the eternal order. This revelation is made supremely in religious experience, where the tension of contrast and estrangement, so typical of man's creatureliness, is resolved by God's redemptive grace into the peace of communion with Him. Revelation is thus, as Unamuno said, itself redemptive, drawing man with cords of love to His true end in God.

And yet this same revelation, which draws man to his true end, makes plain too the impossibility of his reaching it in his own right and by his own effort. There must be a New Creation, a new kind of incorporation of the eternal order in human life. The New Testament and Christian experience affirm such a new incorporation to have taken place in Christ. "Jesus Christ is not the product of history in its cumulative development. He stands within its succession; but He entered it from beyond." In a great chapter entitled "The Incarnation and Organic Conceptions," Fr. Thornton draws out the implications of this theme. Carefully guarding against any notion of the Incarnation as a new stage emerging within the evolutionary process, he points out how in Christ the human organism is taken up to the level of Deity; yet Christ is not Himself an organism, but is organic to the universe and to man; for the highest law of His being is not such as belongs to man, but such as belongs to the eternal Word or Son. Finally, this relationship to man is

actualized in the body of believers through the instrumentality of the Spirit, who makes us participants in the new life brought near by the Incarnate Lord.

Creation, Revelation, Incarnation—it will be seen that all three fundamental concepts of religion are here illuminated and brought into synthesis. That is what an intelligent faith, which seeks to worship with the mind no less than with the heart and the will, demands.

I have dwelt at such length on Fr. Thornton's book because it seems to me to represent the most hopeful line of advance opening before Christian theology in its thought on the Incarnation. The battle is not now set, as once it was, between science and religion: both alike are fighting on the side of the angels against a world which has become dangerously blind to the higher values. But within their own ranks there is a sharp cleavage between those who can rest satisfied with a non-credal and non-institutional mysticism, vaguely but not necessarily attached to Jesus, and those who are led on to the whole faith of the Incarnation, with all that that carries with it for thought, worship, and life. Fr. Thornton's *The Incarnate Lord* is a contribution which none interested in that problem can afford to pass by. Unlike Modernism, it recognizes to the full the rich Christian experience expressed in the dogma of the Incarnation as a primary *datum*, not to be explained away, but to be explained. It relates this to other fields of experience—scientific, social, and æsthetic—in the terms of a philosophy which is in direct connexion with the mathematics, physics, and biology of this century. It turns the flank of many ancient controversies, not by decrying the ability of those once engaged in them, but by giving the issues a new setting and incorporating the truths which theologians were then trying to express in a larger synthesis. And the upshot of the work, difficult though it is in many parts, is to release the spirit of self-oblation to Christ and to the Father in ever-gathering volume of adoration and resolve.

IV*

I propose in this concluding section to consider two difficulties which are widely felt in regard to the Incarnation.

1. The first arises from the side of a thorough-going Evolutionism. What reason have we, it is urged, to suppose that Jesus Christ is in any sense God's last word in self-manifestation, or indeed that any last word is to be expected at all? Evolution has accustomed us to the belief that development is continuous and unending, and that nothing occurs in the course

* The following section deals with certain points in regard to the doctrine of the Incarnation raised in the course of the discussion.

of it to which the word "final" or "absolute" can be properly applied or which can be rightly regarded as a *ne plus ultra*. Jesus, on this view, will be admitted to represent an important new departure in the history of the human race; but to give Him an absolute and final value is to desert the well-tried principles of evolution. We have no guarantee even that man himself is the term of the creative process: he may represent only a stage on the way to the emergence of some higher and more complex being; in which case Christ, even if he were the Incarnation of God in man, would not be the highest expression of Deity possible or conceivable for the universe as a whole.

Let us take this last point first. The belief that man represents a final and absolute value, and is not simply a stage on the way to the production of Super-man, is probably in the last resort incapable of proof: it appears to be, like the belief in free-will, something given in human consciousness and experience. But granting, for the sake of argument, that this experience is illusory, it is not at all obvious that the hypothesis of a Super-man has any better ground. In the last resort, belief in the doctrine of evolution presupposes some criterion of judgment by which higher and lower, progress and degeneration, are distinguished; and this judgment in its turn rests upon the reference to standards of value recognized by man as absolute. Once take away that assumption of evolutionary thought, and there is no more reason for supposing that Super-man rather than Infra-man will be the next stage in evolution.

More than that, there is no reason for supposing that man himself, as he is, is not a by-path, an excrescence, a blind alley, in the process of universal development. The point was put with great force and wit three centuries ago by Montaigne.

> Why should not a goose say (he writes), Every part of the universe is made for me; the earth is for me to walk upon, the sun lights me, the stars shed their influences on me; I find such conveniences in the wind, such others in the water; the vault of heaven regards nothing so favourably as me? I am the darling of nature. Does not man keep me, lodge me, serve me; does not he sow and grind for me? And if he eats me, he eats his fellow-men as well, as I eat the worms which kill and eat him.

In other words, those who speculate with the hypothesis of the Super-man have got to reckon that he already exists—in the goose! The irony of the conclusion seems well fitted to the gambling nature of the speculation which provokes it.

Yet, once more, why stop at a Super-man? Why not go on to the notion of a Super-God? The question is far from trivial. We are becoming accustomed today to a type of evolutionary philosophy which makes much of an emergent Deity. So far from being the Ground and Creator of all that is, God is to be

conceived of on this view as a late comer into His own world, the crown and goal of the evolutionary process.* But, on this showing, how are we justified in regarding Him as its crown and goal? Surely it would be far more rational to suppose that He too represented only a stage on the way to the emergence of Something or Someone else; and theology would have to regard all its ideas about God as belonging to the mere *penumbra* of things before the Super-God had appeared upon the scene.

The truth is that philosophy and theology cannot deal with what is *ex hypothesi* outside all human experience. Scientific knowledge no doubt discovers in what is known certain tendencies or curves which may be projected into the unknown; and much of the intellectual construction of reality presented to us by science today is built up on the validity of this process. But none of these curves would appear to justify the sweeping prognostication of a Super-man or a Super-God. Further, the more we pass from the biological sphere to the human, and the closer we come to history as distinct from "natural science," the less we are able to discover curves to aid our speculation. On the contrary, we tend more and more to find certain events and occurrences which appear to have an absolute significance. This is markedly so in things which embody in peculiar degree what we call beauty, goodness, and truth, especially when this embodiment is in human character, personality, or genius. The *Iliad* of Homer, the Parthenon at Athens, the *Republic* of Plato are all embodiments of these values which we rightly call classical; and in the great saints and spiritual leaders of humanity we see these values given their supreme embodiment in human life.

We may sum up by saying that what the belief in the Incarnation appeals to and presupposes is ordinary human experience. The richness of that experience depends on the measure in which value—and, above all, love—enters into it. Important as are the constructions of experience which science gives us, they depend on an abstraction from the whole of experience, and not least on abstracting the element of value. They may make it overwhelmingly probable that development is a law of the world; but that probability must always be subordinate to the knowledge given us in men's immediate and universal experience of worth and of love in human life. In this experience we do find something which impresses us as ultimate and

* Is this what the Bishop of Birmingham meant when he said in the course of a recent sermon in Westminster Abbey, "The modern Christian finds a unity throughout nature; within this unity the spiritual emerges from the physical and biological. *Having thus emerged, it exists by virtue of its own reality*"? (italics mine). If he did mean this, his words involve a far graver deviation from Christian belief than any he has yet uttered.

absolute. At the same time, these very experiences, in the very measure in which they are accepted as authoritative and final embodiments of value, are also originative of fresh progress. The poet goes to Homer, the sculptor to Phidias, the philosopher to Plato or Aristotle, not as to those who have made any work of his own superfluous and unnecessary, but as to those who have blazed a trail and opened a way to fresh endeavour. And the same is true of the Incarnation. We go to Christ as the complete and final revelation of human personality, but we go to Him in order that we may go out from Him to reproduce His likeness. That is what St. Paul means in his Epistle to the Ephesians, when he speaks of the Church as "the fulness of Him who all in all is being fulfilled." Christ, as Incarnate God, is originative, that is to say, of a new stage in evolution, in which the human race is to grow up into Him in all things. Endorsing as He does man's conviction of His own absolute value, Christ also points him to the line of his own true development; and over against the Christ who was and is there rises the ideal of the Christ that is to be. It is both true and not true that we come to a conclusion in Christ—true, because in Him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily; not true, because He originates a new development in human life, of which we can say little more than that "we know not what we shall be," but that "we shall be like Him as He is."

2. The second difficulty frequently felt about the Incarnation has already been considered in part. Granted, it is urged, that Jesus manifested the perfection of human goodness and was therefore in a final sense a revelation of God to man, does not the category of Immanence rather than of Incarnation suffice to explain Him? Should we not range Him, that is to say, with the great men of genius in history, and say that, just as we reach an absolute in Phidias, or Shakespeare, or Beethoven in different departments of creative art, so in religion we reach an absolute in Christ? We do not speak in those cases of Incarnation, but believe that the divine Spirit was markedly immanent in their personalities: why should we not be content with a similar explanation in His case? God is present in everyone in some degree; if we say that He was present completely in Jesus, in such sort that the divine shone through His personality with a lustre undimmed by the sin and selfishness which are so common in most men, then we seem to have said all that is needed.

Now, it is important first to distinguish two senses in which the term Immanence tends to be used. On the one hand, it is used to denote such a close and intimate relation of God to the world that He becomes almost identical with that which He

indwells. In the last resort, this doctrine is equivalent to Pantheism; but, even when it does not go to such lengths, it is often on the pantheistic side of a line whose demarcation makes all the difference to the depth and quality of religious belief. The type of Modernism for which the distinction between the divine and the human has grown thin is obviously peculiarly exposed to this danger: but it besets equally minds of a predominantly scientific or artistic mould in whom the intricate mechanisms or delicate beauties of sensible things awaken the emotions of wonder and of worship. For the mind, on the other hand, which is nourished on Scripture, this type of Immanentism is not likely to prove attractive; for nothing is more characteristic of the biblical revelation of God than its tremendous and undeviating emphasis upon the divine transcendence. For those who take their stand on that revelation, the doctrine of divine immanence means the doctrine of the transcendent made immanent. It is a doctrine not of *identity* of divine and human, but of *incorporation* of the divine in the human, and of the eternal in the temporal, with more or with less completeness. When they think of God as indwelling man, their conception is expressed by the analogies of seed in soil, of leaven in lump, of light in lamp, rather than by that (let us say) of the impress of form on matter in a work of art.

In other words, the doctrine of divine immanence is a doctrine of divine grace—of a Power or Spirit, other than ourselves, working with transforming energy within us. And the Christology we are at present considering asserts that in Jesus the human soul was so completely given up to, and controlled by, the indwelling Spirit that He may be regarded as in a unique and normative sense the Son of God.

Now, the rock on which any kind of Pantheism or pantheistic doctrine of divine immanence suffers shipwreck is the fact of evil: for we must either attribute evil to God, or else split the identity of God and Man. The organic conception of immanence avoids this rock, but meets another which lies close to it. Not the evil outside us, but the sense of sin within, points to its incompleteness. For nothing is more prominent in the lives of those who have been most manifestly the servants and channels of divine grace—those, in short, whom we call saints—than the reality of their continued penitence, and the force with which they testify to the moral chasm which separates them from God. To grow in grace, that is to say, and to yield the soul more and more fully to the divine indwelling, is to become more and more aware of man's difference and distance from God, and more and more alive to the necessity of pardon and redemption from above. And yet *in Christ there is no*

trace whatever of any such penitence or need. His spiritual experience, that is to say, deviates at a crucial point from that of all others, when on this theory it ought to agree with it. Not that we should expect penitence of Jesus, if He were without sin: but what we should expect is that the presence of grace in the saints would show itself in a like absence of penitence with His. The fact that it does not do so suggests that Jesus and the saints stand respectively in different relations to God; and that what their experience points to is an impossibility in man of attaining to union with God without some radical and recreative change in his standing.

There is, of course, a reverse side to this fact, and it is important. The penitence of the saints does not stand alone, but is matched always by a joyousness and confidence in the overcoming of evil which is not the least among the causes of their influence. "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me," says St. Paul; and St. John can write boldly: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." But this very confidence on the Apostle's part in the divine indwelling provides at the same time the solution of our problem; for it is based at every point upon the supernatural work of Christ. Left to himself, man's progress in grace means a progressive insight into the law of non-attainment which precludes him from union with God: what God has done in the Incarnation is to provide new conditions for spiritual endeavour and consequently new grounds for hope.

Perhaps the issue may be summed up as follows. According to the Immanentist doctrine, Christ is supremely *representative* of God's grace in human life: while according to the doctrine of the Incarnation, He is *causative* of it. There is no light in the human soul, nor strength in the human will, that does not derive from Him, and did not do so even before the Incarnation took place. And yet there is a profound difference between those who enjoy this grace without knowing its Source, and those who—through the teaching of the Church and through the sacraments—are brought into direct contact with its Fountain-head. Few utterances of our Lord are more challenging to any kind of Modernist philosophy than His claim that "among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." There is a divine indwelling in the Church, that is to say, different, because differently conditioned, from any, even of highest measure, outside it; and the ground of it is the Incarnation.

E. G. SELWYN.

THE RELIGION OF THE INCARNATION AND ITS COUNTERFEIT

THE title of this paper is meant to indicate one prominent symptom of the age in which we live—namely, that a very large number of professing Christians, members of all denominations, are disappointed at the fruitlessness of the efforts put forth with increasing energy by the great Society called the Church; and that from that disappointment a great perplexity arises. Men are conscious of a deep dissatisfaction which finds vent in various demands; all pointing to a radical change in the methods adopted by the Church in her warfare with evil. An immense amount of ephemeral writing has been and is being devoted to the explanation of this phenomenon; and it is generally assumed that the change demanded must take one (or both) of two forms: a restatement of the Christian Creed and an increase of effort to be directed to practical social reform.

Our purpose in this essay is not to discuss the remedies proposed but to diagnose the cause of the trouble. That cause, we are convinced, lies in the successful appeal made, not by the Christian Gospel, but by a hollow counterfeit which is presented far and wide to men's minds: sometimes in the form of plausible rhetorical statement, but far more often in the guise of a manner of life which may be described as a more or less strenuous endeavour to make the world a pleasanter place of habitation.

By way of introduction it should be said that underlying the varied and discordant proposals for the betterment of society, whether by secular or religious reform, there is one assumption so generally made that it is reasonable to proceed upon it without discussion, It is that hope lies in our accepting the guidance of Christ's teaching. Now that teaching utters certain notes with a most powerful emphasis, one of them being that we men are constantly being deceived by a personal malignant influence called Satan or the Evil One, and that his influence upon us always tends to commend to our minds some deep untruth of thought, some theory of life so false and so pervading that the author of it would be, on that ground alone, justly called the Father of Lies. For if there has been a Gospel given by God to men, Satan's malignancy will show itself in his efforts to substitute for the truth of Revelation something fundamentally erroneous. In other words, if we take heed to the warnings of the Gospel, as professedly we all do, we shall be

prepared to find that not only today but at all times in Christian history we and our forefathers have been the victims of a great deception. Further, that in the deception a certain element may be discerned which it behoves us to identify as clearly as we can. That element, we are sure, is profoundly congenial to human nature, or it would not have gained such a general acceptance as it has.

Our task, therefore, is to point out the contrast between the form of religion roughly known as Popular Christianity, and the Gospel as handed down by the Church. It would be ridiculous, of course, to try to characterize the Gospel *in toto*; the utmost that is possible being to mention certain essential ingredients which are those most definitely contradicted by the counterfeit. By so doing we may hope to satisfy to some extent the vague but genuine demand for a restatement of revealed truth. No creed can be understood without a consideration of some other creed set in contrast to it. In selecting these essential ingredients in the Divine Revelation we may be guided by the earliest Christian Hymn of Praise which has come down to us from antiquity—the *Te Deum*. Any verse will supply material.

1. "We praise Thee as God."

In the course of ages the intercourse between man and his Maker passes up from the temper of dread to that of praise. Why? Man's experience of the world in which he is set forces upon his notice one disquieting fact after another: the cruelty of Nature; the prevalence of suffering; his own helplessness, and along with it the inextinguishable yearning to rise; the desire which gives him his dignity as lifting him up above the beasts of the field. Further, and far more perplexing than all these, there is the terrible evidence of universal human perversity: the insane impulse to recognize the glory and wonder of that innate desire, and at the same time to prevent by foolish living that it should ever be satisfied. Encompassed thus by tragedy, how has man been able to conceive that bliss hereafter will consist in praising the Creator of such a world as this world and of such beings as mankind?

The answer is, that in the Incarnation God has shown us His own perfect mastery of the situation, and His understanding of our woe, by bearing it Himself.

In contrast, popular Christianity is marked by widespread discontent, or (worse) by indifference, called in Scripture lukewarmness. Both tempers tell against thankfulness and praise, and give a complete explanation of the dislike of church-going. No one can utter gratitude unless he knows of something to be grateful for.

2. "The Father of an Infinite Majesty."

The transmitter of Life: the Father of all: the inclusive title, "it is He that hath made us and not we ourselves." And then "Infinite Majesty": the discoveries of Science show us year by year the unspeakable marvel of the greatness of the Creator, evoking the praise of men by the infinity of His condescension, by the exceeding glory of the life which He, even now, imparts. The Sustainer of the Heavens; and also the Babe in the manger—the carpenter's son; and also the transformer of mankind to perfection (Matt. v. 48).

In contrast, popular Christianity tends to ignore any element in Revelation which baffles man's effortless intelligence. Yet if Revelation did not transcend our finite minds it would not be Revelation at all. Man would have been left to discover it. The wonder of Revelation is not that it is "incomprehensible," but that it may be experienced.

3. "Thou shalt come to be our Judge."

God's stupendous action indicates the deadliness of the canker which has infected all mankind. There must be an infinite need, if it has required the self-abasement of the Creator to satisfy it. Thus our Father, in revealing His Love and Power, wakes up within us the conviction that, according as we receive the Revelation, we shall be judged—*i.e.*, shall be separated into two groups: those who live in thankful dependence on the Life given by God, His Salvation; and those who think they can live without it.

In contrast, popular Christianity cowers before the bare mention of severity—as if there could be Infinite Love which would not turn to severity on being rejected. Any true idea of the Love of God increases the certainty and the awfulness of Judgment.

4. "Vouchsafe to keep us this day without sin."

Man cannot praise or magnify God except by acknowledging his own nothingness. Thus human soul has been defined as "nothingness developing into infinity."* So we see how the Incarnation called forth from man a new virtue, for which no name existed among Greeks or Romans—viz., Humility: the most attractive of all the virtues and the most difficult. The *Te Deum* shows how Humility is born from the contemplation of God's action and attributes.

N.B.—No amount of consideration of the attributes by themselves would have the creative power which the Holy Spirit exercises in us, when we allow Him to interpret to us

* R. M. Benson, *The Magnificat*, p. 2. The saying is illustrated by the mathematical point which has the capacity of becoming a line—or an infinite number of lines disposed as a circle emanating from it.

the Incarnation and Death of the Savoiur. Plato could not rise to this. But the tone of the *Te Deum* is an echo of Rom. xii. 3 (and many other passages).

In contrast, popular Christianity, as the thought of the Incarnation grows dim, inevitably thinks lightly or not at all of sin; either relying on the conventional easygoing creed which prompts resistance to the pressure of circumstances *plus* a little kindness, or imagining progress to be due to human achievement, sometimes called Evolution.

In considering popular Christianity we should be prepared to find that man being, in spite of appearances to the contrary, fundamentally rational, has been unable since the Day of Pentecost, to be convinced that the Christian Gospel is a baseless fancy: it is too unlike the ordinary thoughts of our hearts. But that very fact disposes him to modify the interpretation which the Church has given of the events that took place in Palestine 2,000 years ago. Fcr he feels, as he considers the matter, the burden of an awful responsibility. He must make some answer to the appeal of Infinite Love; and he knows that that answer, if honest, must involve two acknowledgments, both of which, though dictated by his reason, are inexpressibly difficult and painful. One is the immeasurable depth of man's need; the other is the eternity of the issues of this life: for what must be the consequences of rejecting or ignoring the appeal of the Divine Mercy? Hence it is not surprising if the deceiver of mankind (of whom our Lord tells us much, and of whose baneful activity the evidence is overwhelming) has seized the opportunity to play upon man's two great and dominant inclinations: to profess allegiance to Truth and to live by its counterfeit.

The humility, which man for the first time recognized as a virtue after the Resurrection of Christ, and which is demanded of all Christians, may be considered under two aspects: (*a*) moral, and (*b*) intellectual, which are, of course, closely connected. By (*a*) we mean readiness to subordinate *all* desire for self-gratification to the one paramount endeavour to do God's Will, with utter disregard of the suffering involved. By (*b*) we mean acceptance of God's bounty: the welcoming of the ever-renewed Gift of Eternal Life along with an ever deeper recognition of the mystery of Its imparting. Before Pentecost the Apostles received and distributed the food for the multitude without enquiring *how* the increase was given.* After Pentecost the Church has known that the Gift is the Holy Spirit of God Him-

* Visitors to the School of San Rocco in Venice may notice how the artist, depicting the Saviour handing the food to the Apostles, places a tree-trunk so as to conceal the contact of His hands with theirs.

self: the *Dator et Donum* in one. It ought to be far easier for us than it was for the Apostles to acknowledge the ineffable mystery; but in fact we are constantly impelled to nullify the Gift by assuming that we can comprehend the method of Its operation. So we dissolve Its power by analysis.

Now popular Christianity is a form of religion which promises relief from the austerity of Christ's command, "Take up thy cross": but which also involves renunciation of the hope, "Ye are to be perfect." It allows us to profess the uttermost self-surrender, both moral and intellectual, while paring down the divine demand to something tame, manageable and convenient. That is the temper of self-assertion in action: to which the clumsy but expressive term anthropocentricity is correctly applied. It includes the repudiation of both (*a*) moral self-abasement in presence of Christ; and (*b*) intellectual acknowledgment of the stern limitations of the finite mind. The repudiation in all cases is both moral and intellectual, but men are grouped in one class or the other, according to their temperament and endowments.

The group principally concerned with (*a*) is the vast multitude who, mainly without knowing, disown the supernatural character of Christian Ethics; that is, are blind to the divine promise contained in all the commands which plainly transcend our natural powers. It is difficult enough in any case to recognize the action of the Holy Spirit as He gently but not imperceptibly transforms the "hard and sullen mass" into the "heirs of Grace." But it is not only difficult but an affront to our "proper pride" to confess that we are incapable of taking the tiniest step in the right direction, unless we are upborne by His gracious and unstinted power; and, moreover, that the measure of the Gift is in proportion to our humility. The most distinct and startling indication of the spiritual darkness in which we habitually move, is given by numberless proofs of blindness to the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church. It is a fact for which the much abused adjective "tremendous" is strictly appropriate that all—at least in the Anglican Communion—who have taught young people for Confirmation invariably find an almost total ignorance of the meaning of Whitsuntide: that is, of the indwelling in the Church of the Comforter, the Strengthener. From this ignorance is inevitably derived the conformity to the world which is the lukewarmness of Rev. iii.: the acquiescence in the low, easygoing "conversation" of those whose main desire is to banish from human life the claim of the Cross of Christ.

On the whole, then, it may be said that the rejection of the Gospel message by the heedless multitude is due, not to poverty

nor even ignorance, but to self-assertion. The few who withstand the drift of the stream are the humble who know that the answer to the Almighty's overture is not the struggle simply to exist, but thankfulness, with a sense of utter unworthiness. These cannot feel that the prolonging of their paltry time on earth is the answer to His overtures that God wishes us to make. But the ordinary view is that a desire so universal, so alluring, so natural as the desire for temporal happiness may rightly be given the first place. It is not the pressure of circumstances, however tyrannical, which induces man to put his natural desires first, but "anthropocentricity": the acknowledgment of the human claim as if there were something majestic and awe-inspiring about it because it is human. Conversely, the exceptions to this rule are the humble. They perceive and know, when they think on Calvary, that if God has so acted, man may not think of His action as meaningless or unnecessary: but as demanding the homage of all man's heart, mind, soul and strength. That is the theocentric view taught throughout by Christ. In conduct the contrast between the true and the counterfeit Christianity is that the one demands an agonizing and unceasing struggle (Luke xiii. 24); the other is acquiescent and drifts with the stream (Rom. xii. 3).

So far we have been concerned with the rejection of the Gospel by the morally self-assertive. But there is a department of human life which is concerned not so much with conduct—action and behaviour—as with thought. People in England who are intellectually alert, keen on new ideas, eager for knowledge and gifted with the power of literary expression, have always been in a minority: but their influence makes them important.

True and False Modernism

The drama of history is in the response made by mankind to God's offer of salvation. There are only two responses possible. Either the utterance of a mighty desire, *Lord, evermore give us this Bread*: or *We are they that ought to speak: who is lord over us?* We must not fail to notice that the first petition was uttered by the majority of those who thronged the synagogue of Capernaum in the very moment of rejecting the world's Deliverer: because He offered them, not silver and gold or intellectual power or effortless contentment, but the higher Life. Yet they used the same words as the few—perhaps only one or two—who were hungering for righteousness and dimly recognized with Peter that the Speaker had the words of eternal

life. "The same words." For the Father of Lies teaches us to use phrases of heavenly import, though our desires are of the earth, earthy. The words acknowledge God; but the thoughts of the heart are anthropocentric.

Now just as the Jews who rejected Christ spoke as if they needed Him, so it often is today. Like them we all desire something good: something that appeals to us in the form of social betterment, or, less commonly, in the form of intellectual satisfaction. The latter promises a rich reward coveted at all times, but especially by the choicest spirits in Western Europe and America today. Man since Copernicus has been more and more dazzled by the achievements of his own brain-power: first in interpreting the marvels of the Universe, then in utilizing some of them for his security and comfort. Nothing that has happened in the history of civilization has more powerfully drawn mankind towards an over-estimate of his own power for good: to make him claim independence of God by disavowing his own helplessness and the infinite graciousness of the Creator.

If, then, we give heed to the repeated admonitions of the Saviour that *only* as we are like little children we can receive or understand His "unspeakable Gift": *only* as we are loving and uncritical and unboastful can we be truly learners of the Truth: we become aware of a deadly peril. We are startled out of our childlikeness by the dazzling manifestation of human brain-power which has, like a new Samson, broken the bonds of tradition and inertia of mind, and fear of the unknown. Of old the poet sang, "The heavens declare the glory of God." Today we do not sing, but we say and think, "The heavens declare the glory of Man. Man's intellect is not to be baffled. Humility is all very well in its place, but the gift of analysis knows of no limitations; there are no secrets it cannot pluck from the firmament above or the earth beneath; and if any presume to declare a mystery, something beyond the horizon of Science, it is worthless and may be ignored."

Such is the claim of many of our acutest thinkers; and among the intellectual aristocracy of the civilized nations few there be that dispute it. The credentials of Science, Historical Research—reconstruction of the past—are irrefutable. Nobody in his senses believes that Reason is not a faculty of priceless value; therefore it must be used: and if it is incompatible with humility, humility must give way. "We are they that ought to speak: who is lord over us?"

This is the spirit of self-assertion, and, though it is far more moderate than it was thirty years ago, its voices are still imperious and strong. It has given birth to teaching that strips the divine Revelation of all mystery: that is, to deny that there

has been a Revelation at all—on the assumption that Truth is not God's Gift, but man's discovery.

The difficulty of the situation is that the intellectual processes which seem to work havoc with the faith of the simple in some cases have given us a great enrichment of mind and enlarging of our horizon. Where they have had fair play they have set old truths in a new setting and shown us the methods of God's training of His children. Rising far above the clever writers who are attractive merely from their freshness, there stand out the pioneers of Old Testament scholarship along with the greatest of the men of Science and certain interpreters of History: all of whom have in their measure reminded us of the background of Reality behind, below and above the shifting phantasmagoria of human life.

We will take two examples from the critics of the Bible who have taught things not only fresh and stimulating, but of abiding value from the inexhaustible treasure-house of God's Word: Robertson-Smith and Bishop Westcott. Both were men of commanding intellectual power and originality, and both were strangely misinterpreted. Robertson-Smith showed how the Hebrews in their earliest days were barbarous as other Semites were. To him this fact was a great encouragement. His inference from it was that in the O.T. history we have a manifestation of the power of God's Grace, working upon a most intractable material for the fashioning of a nation from whom the Redeemer of the Universe was to be born. That was an interpretation of history from which some of his readers derived a quickened hope in the purpose and promise of Creation. But the teaching was to others simply disturbing and negative. They could not brook being told that the Chosen People were once like Canaanites, Hivites and Perizzites, with very similar forms of worship and superstitions. But the more degraded the stock, the more wonderful the transforming power of the Creator, Who from such coarse and ignoble beginnings could in process of time mature a race from which Jeremiah, the Baptist, and the Nazarene were born.

Then as to Westcott. His teaching, the consecration of his mighty power of brain from beginning to end of his life bore witness to the wonder and glory of the Incarnation. The O.T. scholars, sometimes unwittingly, have illuminated for us the process of preparation for the Gospel. They show how all history converges on to the central event in time. Westcott and a whole army of students and thinkers with him have disclosed the inexhaustibleness of the lessons to be gathered from the Fact itself. The one group testify, "This hath God done." The others sing the praise of the Creator: this is what

God is doing and will do: to wit, the Redemption of the world and the conquest of the kingdom of evil. They are alike in the unity of their theme, theocentric throughout: they only differ in presenting different aspects of the Divine Action.

But as soon as we fix our thoughts on God as acting, we become aware of a mystery. All the good that is done on earth is done by God, but through man. Man, therefore, seems to be warranted in claiming some of the credit for himself; and men of intellect and of anthropocentric minds are strongly inclined to exaggerate his share in the process of development, or to call it Evolution and leave the Deity more and more out of account. The Bible is a continuous record of man's repudiation of God in the character of a Saviour: on the part of the unthinking multitude who feel no piercing need of Salvation: on the part also of intellectuals who, affronted by the stern challenge that they should believe what they cannot understand, and wearied by the repetition of formulæ that seem to them inadequate, craving also for *freshness* at any cost in the presentation of truth, are eager for restatement of the Church's position; somewhat reckless as to how far their pet restatement involves loss of Truth. So far, let us note, they are obeying the almost irresistible anthropocentric instinct. There are the writers and teachers who are called "Modernists": the most fallacious title ever applied to any group of human beings, as will shortly appear.

The instinct alluded to being entirely natural impels us to interpret the Gospel message in terms less awful than those familiar to us from time past. In other words, we crave for a creed which allows a less terrifying sense of responsibility than that of Nicæa. We shrink from any affirmation which demands of us moral impossibilities, or any genuine intellectual humility: yet we cannot help reverencing the moral beauty of Christ's character and the sublimity of His teaching. Hence as a resultant from these imperious desires there has come to be a fashionable presentation of Christianity which allows us to think easily of sin, instead of shuddering at it as St. Paul did, or weeping for it as Christ did. Thus the first modification we make is to cut away the severity of the Gospel expressed towards all who reject it because they do not like it. This promises a huge relief from a horrible nightmare of "Eternal Punishment," and at the same time rids us of an intellectual contradiction. Then the select minority who can appreciate the triumphs of Science readily dispense with all articles of belief which include the sacramental operations of the Holy Spirit: those which transcend the ordinary sequence of cause and effect, the transformation of matter by spirit: the raising of

things created into the glory of Heaven. What is left is a bare assent to the dogma of the Divinity of Christ, which we can assent to, provided that it is shorn of its incomprehensible elements, and is interpreted vaguely as an inoperative mercy. These are some only of the characteristics of the teaching given by the left wing of the group known as Modernists. Those who are in sympathy with these doctrines justify their attitude by pointing to certain apparent facts: the failure of the Church to reach the masses and the stupid repetitions of traditional phrases by preachers. That the former is apparent no one could deny. But what inference is to be drawn? Does it make no difference that Christ foretold the rejection of His message by the majority of each generation? The miracle, of course, is the reception of it by the minority. What but the renewing power of the Spirit of Wisdom can explain how that in every age there are some of the proud sons of men who learn to welcome the Gospel of Humility? That we mortals, born to glorify strife and bloodshedding can yet worship the Prince of Peace? That men of colossal intellect are yet found to pray as the little prophet prayed: "Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth"? Or again: "The humble shall hear thereof and be glad"? Yes, but why then should we modify the Gospel message to suit the proud?

In truth the popular rejection of the Cross of Christ is a terrible but not unexpected fact. It is so frequent as to be by now commonplace, monotonous, traditional. How is it, then, that clever men who abhor traditionalism and dullness ignore the wonder and the glory of God's Epiphany, and magnify the commonplace of human conceit?

Yet it is but natural. All alike know what Modernists mean when they call upon preachers and teachers: "Give us something living and fresh." We agree that life and freshness are beautiful things, but unless they are symptoms of a firm grip on the true they are spurious. Truth is vastly more important than attractiveness, and though it be based on tradition it is never dead nor stale. We must discriminate between the transient intellectual stimulus given us by analysis ending in denial, and the wonder at the revitalizing of old truths which is given every day to the prayerful* and the simple-hearted. That renewal, though ever manifold, ever fresh and adaptable to a changing world, is always a reinterpretation of the eternal fact in history, the taking of our flesh by the Son of God. That is the grand criterion of the two groups. It is a dismal con-

* Very pertinent is the pregnant phrase in Tit. i. 1: "the fresh Knowledge of Truth which is given according as we pray." But *ἐπίγνωσις* is the answer to those who ask as *πτωχοί* (Mt. v. 3).

fusion of thought which gives them the same name. False Modernism is as old as the Day of Pentecost; when some, eager to deny, said: "These men are full of new wine." St. Peter answered them by reinterpreting an old prophecy. That was true Modernism.

There is one more test and we have done. When we call upon the Church for a restatement of doctrine we often forget that forms of expression which alert-minded folk feel to be outworn may be the only means of letting the truth into the minds of the poor (Matt. xi. 5), the "little ones," the children. Let us imagine a man converted from rebelliousness and carnality to the love of Christ, as is portrayed for us by Masefield's poem "The Everlasting Mercy." (That is a miracle far more wonderful than the raising of Lazarus, for the overcoming of the resistance of matter by the Creator is nothing compared to the transformation of a human soul without coercion. It is a miracle which happens every day.) Let us suppose, further, that some well-equipped scholar had met the labourer still in Satan's grip and had eloquently told him of the choicest results of research, the most suggestive triumphs of reason and analysis; of evolution, higher criticism, and comparative religion; of Q and the Logia and all. The miracle would not have been wrought. The sinner might conceivably have responded far enough to ask if the Parable of the Prodigal Son was true. What happened was that the Holy Ghost enabled him to surrender himself to the call of the Divine Love uttered down the ages from the hill of Calvary: a call potent because it transcends the greatest intellects the world has ever known. The question to be faced is which of the two methods best conveys the living Truth. We may listen to the wise words of a great intellectualist who was yet a humble seeker after God: "Historical error, if honest, is better (and less misleading) than spiritual darkness. For example: it is much better (and less misleading) to remain in the old-fashioned belief that a good and wise God created the world in six days, than to adopt a new belief that a bad or unwise or careless God—or a chance or a force or a power—evolved it in sixty times six sextillions of centuries" (Edwin Abbott, *Silanus the Christian*, p. 8).

Summary

There is a false "Modernism" very vocal at the present time, though its votaries are few. It is in essence a traditional form of repudiation of the claim of the Cross of Christ, and attracts as it has done for 1900 years by promising relief from the pain of self-conquest and of intellectual humility. There

is a true Modernism which welcomes the sublime mysteries of the Gospel, not because they can be simplified, but because they are transcendent, and yet can be experienced by the honest-hearted and the simple. The glory of them is that though their manifestation is ever fresh, yet it is eternal and abideth.

"Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God: and this is the spirit of the antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it cometh; and now it is in the world already" (1 John iv. 2, R.V.).

"No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 3, R.V.).

E. LYTTELTON.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

BISHOP GORE asks us to forestall a misinterpretation of his teaching on the subject of the *kenosis* which might be caused by a passage (on p. 36 of the July number) in the article on the Incarnation contributed by the present writer. He desires to make it clear that he has never taught a doctrine of absolute *kenosis* such as was taught by *e.g.* Godet, but has suggested that a *kenosis within the sphere and limits of the incarnate and mortal life* was necessitated by the facts as to our Lord's consciousness given in the Gospels. We shall hope to return to this point more fully in a later issue, but desire to insert this much without delay, and to express our regret if we have done Bishop Gore any injustice.

The Notes on Prayer published below have already appeared in substantially the same form in the quarterly Syllabus of the Central Society of Sacred Study, and we are grateful to Dom Bernard and to the Warden of Keble for permission to reprint them here. They seem to us of a character likely to interest as large a public as they can find.

NOTES

NOTES ON HOW TO PRAY

THE title seems to challenge comparison with Père Grou's great book bearing the same name, but the title was selected by the Editorial Secretary of the C.S.S.S., and has been kept as being a convenient and easily grasped description of the subject to be dealt with.

I. INTRODUCTORY

For the purposes of these notes the word "Prayer" is taken to mean the whole process of loving intercourse between the soul and God, and any method whatever in which this is expressed.

This, of course, includes what is commonly called "Saying Prayers."

But just as in our ordinary intercourse with our fellow men we are in the habit of sometimes conveying our ideas to them by means other than words—*e.g.*, taking off our hat, shaking hands, or even hitting a man violently on the nose—so in expressing our ideas to God we shall also use other methods, and this should be borne well in mind as being quite a natural thing, even though it will be only briefly touched on here.

All this wide, general use of the word "Prayer" is dealt with by the science of Ascetic Theology. Or, speaking of it in a slightly different way, Ascetic Theology deals with the soul's journey to God, and tells us of all the different scenery and weather and helps and hindrances which we shall meet with on the way.

II. Vocal Prayer

This is the expressing *in words* of our ideas and desires to God. It may convey any sort of idea—prayer for ourselves or for others (asking for things), confession of sin or weakness, thanksgiving, praise, etc., just as words may be used to convey any sort of idea from ourselves to a fellow man or woman.

Vocal Prayer is used very largely in the public worship of the Church, almost always combined with some sort of action, especially in the Eucharist and in the other more solemn ceremonials, though in the recitation of the Divine Office action plays a very small part, and is not a fundamental necessity. Only the most casual acquaintance with Liturgiology is necessary to see that in the Church's public worship Vocal Prayer is an important part—*but only a part*—of the whole business.

And it will be the same in our private prayer. We shall always to some extent need Vocal Prayer, and we shall always be bound to use a certain amount of it in public worship and administration of the sacraments, but some of the greatest moments of prayer in our lives will be those in which no words pass our lips at all, when it may be we express by some outward action our great love and desire to God, or perhaps when without any action whatever God, as it were, stoops down and touches our soul with the fire of His Holy Spirit, and our little spark of love for Him just for an instant blazes up into a flame in which all unworthy things are burnt and dead. (As we shall see when we come to consider the subject of Meditation, Vocal Prayer may be at times of great service in helping to fan this spark into flame.)

And some simple souls have quite certainly gone to heaven having never known any other than Vocal Prayer. This is, however, rather too often taken as a precedent by some of us when we are too lazy or too disinclined to exercise the further faculties for prayer which God has given us. The servant with one talent might quite easily have entered into the joy of his Lord, and the one with ten might equally easily have made a different finish. Beginners reading books about Prayer are apt to overlook the fact that *the manner in which we pray* is of course regulated by the talents and opportunities entrusted to us, but *our entry into heaven* or not will be regulated by the use we make of them.

The commonest forms of vocal prayer, apart from public worship, are:

(*a*) *The "Our Father."* "When ye pray, say . . ." That should be all the comment we need for the moment.

(*b*) *The Psalms.* All the great saints have used the Psalms very much in their private vocal prayers as well as frequently making use of parts of them for meditation and other methods of prayer. And our Lord used at least one Psalm on the Cross.

(*c*) Such forms of prayer as the Benedicite, the Gloria in Excelsis, the Gloria Patri, the Te Deum, the Divine Praises, other Canticles such as the Magnificat and Benedictus, and other prayers such as the Anima Christi.

The saints have used at least some of these over and over again, countless times singing or saying them to our Lord. And just as mostly it is the old songs that we men grow to love best in this life, is it too homely a thought that also in our spiritual intercourse with the Perfect Man, who is our divine Lover, we do well to sing again those old songs which the saints who loved Him and served Him best used to sing while they were on earth?

And perhaps there will be joy in heaven, as they—and the angels—hear the old words of faith rising again and again before the throne of God from the very modern Christians of this new age.

(*d*) And in addition to this, because we are His friends we may speak to Him sometimes exactly as we wish, saying to Him what is in our heart, just as we should say it to any other friend whom we loved dearly, and to whom we wished to give all our confidence.

Now and then it will make our private vocal prayers seem more real if we can get somewhere where we shall not disturb or inconvenience anyone else, and then just say audibly—in a whisper, it may be—our prayers to JESUS.

In Vocal Prayer our lips should move, and we should actually frame the words with our lips, even if we say nothing audibly. To those who tell us with contempt that we apparently have nothing to say to God, as we have to pray out of a book, we can reply that those who make music for our ears on earth play most frequently music written down by the great masters who went before them. So when we pray to God we may well make use of what has been written down by the great masters of prayer. Never let us be ashamed of this. In all other departments of life we follow the best that has been done by our predecessors—*e.g.*, in cooking, housebuilding, doctoring, farming, etc. And if in the end, as is possible, God means us to be leaders and to show people new ways, even then we must first learn to follow before we can lead, and in prayer as in everything else we must learn first the best ways, lest if we start off on our own we may do something very silly and perhaps do much harm.

III. MENTAL PRAYER

A. *Meditation.*—In Vocal Prayer we pray with our voice—in Mental Prayer we pray with our mind—but this is only a rough distinction based on the meaning of the two words (Vocal and Mental). For to a certain extent our minds are used in Vocal Prayer always—otherwise we should not know at all what we were saying or doing. And in Mental Prayer we sometimes use the voice, and, further, in some of the higher forms of Mental Prayer the mind seems to be scarcely used consciously at all. In both forms of prayer the affections are used, and behind all prayer there must be always the driving power of the will. But roughly the distinction of Voice and Mind holds good, and is convenient.

The most common form of Mental Prayer, and the form with which most folk enter on this kind of prayer, is called Meditation.

In Meditation we argue with ourselves, plead with ourselves for God—rather as if we were preaching a sermon to convert ourselves—blowing and blowing, first gently and then harder, at the one spark of love which is in our souls towards God, until at last a little flame of love for Him breaks out in us, and leaps up to Him, burning up at least some one unworthy thing in us before it dies down again, perhaps until the time of our next Meditation. But by this much we are the better, in that at least that one unworthy thing has ceased to be in us, or that we have set our wills—purified by the fire—to conquer some evil habit for God, or to strengthen some weak place in the fortress of our soul, or to confess some sin long hidden, or to love and learn better and more fully one of the wonderful beauties of God.

We may use for this arguing with ourselves either some heads of

meditation given in a book, or we may use a picture, or a crucifix, or we may read and fix in our minds some incident in our Lord's Life or Passion, or one of His parables or conversations, or other parts of the Sacred Scriptures, or other books. But the object is always the same—to stir up our spark of love into flame. And Meditation can never be a sort of dreamy period when we are sometimes half asleep, but the will and the mind must be working all the time, and working hard. We may not *enjoy* this as much as we enjoy some other kinds of prayer, but the results of our work will be as apparent afterwards as the results of hard and methodical digging in the spring are apparent as the beauty of the garden later in the year. The beauty of the saints' souls was often the beauty of the turf which—the grass having been sown—has then been weeded and rolled and cut regularly for 300 years.

The garden of our soul will become a cool and pleasant place for the Lord JESUS to walk in, in accordance with the amount of dull and hard and tiring work we put into it now.

The most usual method of meditation is as follows:

*(i.) *Remote Preparation.*—This consists in simply trying to lead our life from moment to moment as our Lord wishes. We are to be always looking at the ideal set before us in the Sacred Humanity of our Lord, and attempting to follow it more closely each day than the day before. We shall always be finding that this means carrying a Cross, and there is no possibility of making progress in prayer unless we are prepared for this carrying of the Cross. Nearly all men know that this is true, and many give up almost all prayer, and rest content with a sort of imitation Christianity, because they fear the sacrifices or sufferings to which our Lord would lead them.

(ii.) *Immediate Preparation.*—This consists in the choosing of a subject for our next Meditation. Having chosen it, it should be read through or considered overnight, or at least some hours before the time of meditation. There is no need at the time of this reading to give more than ordinary attention to the subject, and when it has been read it may be dismissed from the mind until the time of meditation, unless there be some peculiar desire to dwell upon it. If we are not using a book at all, then a few minutes should be spent overnight in reviewing the course which we desire our meditation to follow.

(iii.) *Opening of the Meditation.*—It is well to begin with some short Vocal Prayers, said kneeling. St. Francis de Sales recommends the Lord's Prayer, the Hail Mary, and the Apostles' Creed—or we may use the Veni Creator, the Veni, Sancte Spiritus, the Collect "O God, who hast prepared for them that love thee . . . ," or some of the various prayers, some useful, and some less useful, which will be found in many books of devotion. Whatever prayers we use they should last only a few moments, perhaps a minute or a minute and a half out of the half-hour's meditation time.

Next should follow a similar period of complete silence and rest before God, while the thoughts of the things of everyday life so far as possible die away in our minds—like an echo dying away. (Difficulties arising at these times will be dealt with later, p. 105.)

And after this should follow again a minute or so of more complete

* In paragraphs (i.) to (vii.) which follow I am very deeply indebted to Fr. Wilfred Knox's book on *Meditation and Mental Prayer* for the general scheme, and for many of the actual phrases. Much of what is said in these paragraphs will be found more fully dealt with there.

silence still, when in our inmost being we place ourselves before God. With some people this is better described as an opening of the soul to God for Him to come in, remembering that if He comes in He must have our whole being to do with quite completely as He wishes. It may be a help at this stage to just whisper very softly to our Lord over and over again slowly and sweetly the Holy Name "JESUS," or to use some other little ejaculatory prayer. (Ejaculatory: *Jaculum*, a dart. Little darts of love thrown up from our heart to God.)

All this procedure should not total more than six minutes of our time at the outside. If it takes longer it must be cut down to smaller limits. The above three stages are to be like various small rooms we pass through on going to the presence of the King.

(iv.) *The Meditation itself.*—This may be made in any position that suits the individual best. If the Meditation is made where others are present, then the position chosen should be at least reverent, and should not be such as to distract our neighbours. Fidgeting about should also be avoided as far as possible, lest we make the meditations of others almost impossible to carry on. If we are quite alone, either in a church or elsewhere, then we may use any position or gestures that may help us.

The Meditation may roughly follow such lines as these: (*a*) What is the lesson which the subject chosen is intended to teach us? (*b*) How does it apply to me? (*c*) Why is it necessary, or just, or desirable, or right, that we should apply it in practice to our lives? (*d*) How far have we allowed the teaching of our subject up to now to have made any difference to our life whatever? (*e*) If we are honest we shall probably admit that it has made little difference, if any—and we shall admit this because we are not asking ourselves what our life looks like to other men, but what it looks like set alongside what our Lord meant it to be when He chose us to be members of His Mystical Body—living limbs of the Body of Christ. (*f*) Granted that we have fallen short of this, what are the reasons which have caused us personally to fail, and what methods, if we wished and had the courage, could we adopt to improve our conduct for the future?

(We may consider all this from two or three different "points" during our meditation, or only from one point, and the points may be either connected or (except quite indirectly) unconnected. Two or three connected points are usual, but it is quite immaterial, and a man may do about this what seems most suited to his character and abilities.)

(v.) *Acts.*—We now come to the lifting up—on our fortunate days the flaming up—of our soul to God. And remember that this is the climax of our meditation. Our emotions may help us, or they may not help us at all. If they don't, we must lift up our soul somehow as best we can, however inadequately it may seem to us we are doing it. It is just possible, as will be pointed out below, that this laborious "lifting up" on our "worst" days, may be of greater value even than the joyous "lifting up" of our "best" days.

We lift up our soul in (i.) Penitence—for, however we have lived, we have not lived as if we were JESUS; (ii.) Hope that we may come nearer to this ideal. We can be saints from now onwards if we will. God made us for that, and if we are using His gifts for anything else we are just as foolish as a man who tries to use the works of a crane to plough land with, or the engine of a Rolls-Royce to tell the time by; (iii.) Thanks, for His long patience with us in our stupidity and coldness and carelessness to Him; (iv.) Self-surrender, a complete giving of ourselves to Him, without any

reserve whatever, for anything He may choose to put upon us or send us or allow us to bear in the future.

At first we may find it best to use definite acts of Penitence, Hope, etc., expressed in words taken either from Holy Scripture or from some other book. Later we shall use our own words, and in time probably (but by no means necessarily) no words at all. Almost certainly it is best at first to use words, so that we do not drift into that vague state mentioned above.

As soon as it becomes a strain to continue with this stage of Meditation we can go on—either to the next point (if we have been dealing completely with the points one by one), or to the last stage of the Meditation (if we dealt with all the points before we got as far as this).

(vi.) *The Resolution.*—This should nearly always be something quite simple and direct which we can carry into effect that very day. It should *not* be merely an indefinite resolve that we will live a better life, or that we will love God better, or be more humble. It should be something quite definite which we believe our Lord would wish us to do, or which we desire to offer to Him in return for His great love.

There is no reason why we should not make the same resolution day after day for four or five days, driving the thing home into our character as with repeated blows of a hammer—but it is not well to continue for more than four or five consecutive days in this way, or the resolution is apt to become merely mechanical and to lose force. It is, however, quite possible to have two or three resolutions "on tap," so to speak, and to use them in turns until they have achieved at least some part of that change in our character or life at which they were aimed.

This resolution does not bind under sin—unless the contrary act is in itself sinful in any case.

(vii.) *The Colloquy.*—A very few moments at the end should be given to an informal talk with our Lord, telling Him how and where you think you have failed in this Meditation, and telling Him of your resolution, and asking His grace to keep it.

Such is the practice of Meditation, which is the commonest—and usually the first—form of Mental Prayer.

B. *Further Progress.*—In Meditation we, as it were, preach a sermon to ourselves, using all kinds of arguments and reasons, with the object of stirring up our love towards God. Now as our spiritual life and its meditations go on, and we come gradually further along our soul's journey, it will happen to many souls that they come to fall more deeply in love with God, and by degrees it ceases to be necessary to spend so much time in argument with themselves, because the fire of love is now well established, and it only needs a very little blowing to cause it to spring up into a strong blaze. This often goes with a life of quite ordinary appearance. You may see something similar in the case of a man undergoing great sorrow or bereavement. He may be acting apparently quite ordinarily, but it will only require some chance reference to his sorrow to bring the whole thing vividly before his mind again, and to move him so that for the moment it completely fills his life, and he may even burst into tears. This may be caused by a remark of someone's, or by some few words in a book, or just from some train of thought of his own. In the same way, as a man's love of God becomes greater, it only requires some slight reference in word or book or his thoughts to set it blazing

up so that for the moment it entirely fills him—sometimes he cannot go on with his ordinary life for a short time; he must go away and be with God alone until it has begun to pass.

Such a man will usually not want much argument with himself at the beginning of his mental prayer. His affections will generally leap up towards God with very little provocation—like a schoolboy dismissed and free at the end of school-hours. This will not always happen to him, because he will still have his dark days, but when it begins to happen such a man is passing—or has passed—from Meditation into the next form of Mental Prayer, usually called Affective Prayer, or the Prayer of the Affections.

After spending a long time—it may be—at this Affective Prayer, he will perhaps pass slowly into a further stage, called by most writers the Prayer of Simplicity, or the Prayer of Simple Regard. Here the fire of his love no longer needs blowing or fanning to bring it to a blaze. It burns continually and brightly, sometimes leaping high, and sometimes burning down, but never dying very low. Such a large fire will need much fuel, and you will find a man at that stage sometimes bringing every costliest treasure he possesses, and heaping them all up on his fire in sacrifice to God, not because they were valueless or wrong, but because he only cares that his love may burn more brightly.

This stage is spoken of as the Prayer of Simplicity, because it is not any longer made up of many considerations of the goodness, truth, kindness, forgiveness, etc., of God, or of our own failures and denials of Him, or of any other mixed considerations at all, but all are summed up in the love that passes continuously from the soul to God. Just as in a great and deep love between two human beings, man and woman, or man and man, we do not any longer bother to consider beauty or kindness or accomplishments or powers which moved and attracted us, it may be, at first; *now* all that matters is that I love the other and the other loves me. It is also sometimes known as the Prayer of Simple Regard, because it is not full any longer of conversation and words, but it is, as it were, a lover looking at his Beloved. So in this world we talk often a great deal to *acquaintances*, but we are sometimes silent—and perfectly happy—with our *friends*, unless we have something we wish to say. Some men at this stage with God seem driven to go away from men and be alone with Him, mixing either not at all or to a very limited extent with their fellow men, but in their silence and solitude almost certainly lifting up by their prayers many sad and sinful folk who will never be reached or helped by word of mouth. Others at the same stage seem quite happily to carry on with every activity of life, mixing quite freely everywhere, simply finding God in every place and in every company and in everything, and always perfectly able to distinguish His Voice above and through the noises of the world.

It is entirely a question of vocation—of which particular life God calls a man to. Sometimes He even seems to call a soul to a period of one of these sorts of life, followed by a period of the other sort.

There we will leave the soul for the present, her gaze fixed on God, and God's gaze fixed on her in love, like old Père Chaffangeon at Ars, who, when the Curé asked him what he said to God in his prayers, just said, "He looks at me, and I look at Him." It is there that God will come to fetch you if it be that He calls you to walk amid the high and wonderful beauty and danger of the paths of prayer that lie beyond.

This is the highest you may attain with the ordinary grace which is given to every man and woman, but this degree any soul with perseverance may reach. The rest is with God.

IV. Detached Notes.

A. *Impetration.*—Asking for things, either for ourselves or for others. Our Lord said that whatever we asked the Father for, in His Name, believing, we should receive. Yet there are cases where we imagine we have fulfilled these conditions, but do not receive. The following points are probably worth noting:

(i.) It is not possible to ask *in our Lord's Name* for anything which is contrary to His eternal purposes. To take an extreme case, it is not possible to ask in our Lord's Name that a certain soul, for which He died, may go to hell. Nor is it possible in our Lord's Name to pray that the life of someone beloved by us may be prolonged indefinitely in this world (though it may be prolonged temporarily on one or more occasions in answer to such prayer), death being the common lot of men.

(ii.) It is quite possible that our ordinary reactions to suffering, in others who are obviously beloved of God, may be entirely wrong. It is almost certain, for instance, that had one of us had the making of arrangements for our Lord's Mother at the time of His crucifixion we should have placed her safely in Heaven before Good Friday, so that she might have been free from the suffering it must otherwise cause her. Our Lord, on the other hand, set her at the foot of His Cross. It may well be that while sin endures in the world, suffering is the special privilege of those He would make His closest friends. Further, if we are really members of His Mystical Body, then, as with His Human Body, *He* may choose to suffer *in* some particular member, such as you or me or someone we love, whether (by the co-ordination of our will with His) we have been useful members or not. This subject might well have a whole paper devoted to it, but it is at least obvious, that if there be anything in this theory at all, some of the prayers we make for the removal of suffering and sorrow will be contrary to the highest good of those for whom we pray, and cannot therefore be "in our Lord's Name," although we may have *said* they are and may *think* they are.

(iii.) Other cases will occur to anyone who thinks about the thing—*e.g.*, the case of the dying man whose soul is saved, but who, *if* his life were prolonged, would use his free-will against God, and would go to hell. Further, there are gifts, material and spiritual, which would infallibly ruin the soul of the recipient if given, although at the time of asking this may only be known to God.

(iv.) None of these cases impairs our Lord's promise in the slightest, any more than the omnipotence of God is impaired by the fact that He cannot lie.

(v.) Our prayers for others are much too frequently concerned with begging God to alter something He is doing or something which He has permitted. Our Lord said, "When ye pray, say, Our Father," etc. Suppose, then, that more frequently than at present we take this prayer, and use it *for* the person or cause for which we desire to pray, whatever their need may seem to us to be. If this prayer is granted—that is to say, if in that person or cause God's Name is hallowed, and His Kingdom comes, and His Will is done as it is in Heaven, etc.—what more could we

possibly achieve? For if that prayer be granted, the person or cause for whom or which we have prayed will be perfect, and no sorrow or suffering can matter in the very least one way or the other.

(Other prayers—*e.g.*, the Anima Christi—may be used in this way, with intention for particular persons and causes or bodies of people, in fact for all the many intercessions we are asked to offer.)

N.B.—A further development of this idea comes when we offer, say, a Gloria to our Lord on behalf of—or it may be in reparation for—those who never praise Him; or when we add to our night prayers one "Our Father" for those who never say any prayers to Him at all. This leads on to the whole question of penance and reparation offered to God for sinners and for the wounds and insults offered by the sins of men upon the Love of God, but any discussion of this would lead us beyond the limits of this paper.

B. *Difficulties in Prayer.* (i.) *Wandering Thoughts.*—These in themselves are quite harmless, just as foot-passengers or a dog-fight outside the windows of a school—or even entering the schoolroom itself—are in themselves harmless, the harm being done, not by their presence or passing, but by the wandering of the student's attention from the object of his study, and the turning of it to the consideration of the foot-passenger or the dog-fight.

Similarly around the focus of our attention, which in the case we are considering is God, there is in our consciousness a sort of half-lit area in which anything moving catches our "mind's eye," and tends to lure it into shifting the focus of its attention. If a mouse runs across the floor just within your sphere of vision when you are deep in reading a book, you will get a rough illustration of what happens.

The "cure" for the average wandering thoughts then is not (*a*) to drive them out (so often recommended, but taking so much time, and in the end usually achieving nothing. You do not ask a child in school to get up and drive away every passer-by!), or (*b*) to make each as it comes a subject of intercession (sometimes recommended, but unless one is habitually exceedingly pious one's wandering thoughts are not always suitable subjects for intercession—either for or against!—*e.g.*, it is hard to see what profitable intercession can be made out of a vague speculation as to who will win the Boat Race, or whether someone has yet found an invitation to Bridge which one had left at their rooms before coming into church; besides, this is not our time for intercession, but for a totally different type of prayer), but (*c*) to do what we should counsel the schoolboy to do about passers-by, and to train ourselves to get on with our task, and to disregard these passing thoughts, even though we are conscious of them. If instead of a passing thought it is a real dog-fight, then it may be we must call upon the Master for help, and we may have in that case to stop and help drive it out, but this is not to be often, and we must not exaggerate the ordinary passing thought into an importance which it does not in the least deserve. You will need a lot of hard work and time to do this. If one has just joined one's Preparatory School it is not well to start moaning because one has as yet no University Degree. But it is not wandering thoughts that are the trouble, but wandering attention. We shall never stop thoughts flitting through our minds, but with care and trouble we can fix the attention.

(ii.) *Aridity, Spiritual Dryness.*—"I used to have great joy in my prayers and my Confessions and Communions. The Lord Jesus used

to move me to tears sometimes. It was all desperately real to me. And now everything seems dead, and my heart is always cold and unmoved, and I feel a sham if I pray at all."

(*a*) What is your main object in prayer? To produce a comfortable feeling? "What went ye out into the wilderness for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment?"

(*b*) Two men are praying from 11.30 p.m. till midnight to-night in two adjoining houses. One is prostrate at the feet of the Lord, swept away in a sweetness which is more wonderful than ever he had dreamed. He would love to go on praying like that all night. The other has had no feelings whatever for years in his prayer, and to-night he is more weary than ever, and he hates praying and wants to stop. And yet he forces himself to continue until the prayer he set himself to make is finished. And he stays on his knees by a deliberate effort for one moment longer, and says, "Lord, I offer it to Thee, and I thank Thee for giving me the strength to go on just this one more night through the darkness for Thy dear sake. And one day, when Thou wilt, not when I will, the morning will come and the light will come back into my soul."

Which of these two men is *giving* most to God? And which is the higher vocation, if indeed there *is* any difference in their vocations at all?

The truth is that all honest prayer falls into one or other of two main categories: (1) Prayer in which we are receiving from God, and (2) Prayer in which we are giving to God. We must face the fact that *we* shall have to give in our turn, or perhaps to give altogether for many years.

(*c*) You will pass through all sorts of scenery and weather as your soul journeys to God. Don't sit down and do nothing when you come to a hot, dusty piece of the road. There will be streams to rest at for a few moments by the way, but the end of the journey is not yet. And it doesn't matter whether you *feel like* going on or not. All that matters is whether you *do* go on or not. It is *on that* that your arrival or non-arrival at the journey's end depends.

(*d*) Once or twice in a lifetime God takes a man up into a high mountain and shows him from there the Heavenly City away in the distance, and he can see quite clearly how to get there, what forests must be passed through, what mountains climbed, what deserts crossed, etc. And then he comes down from the mountain and starts his journey, and immediately he does this he can no longer see his goal at all. Only after many years of hard travel, it may be, God takes him into a high place again, and he sees that the goal is nearer.

(*e*) This darkness or coldness is often God's first great question to us. We have served Him, it may be, pretty faithfully in the joy and the light, and now He says, "*How much* do you love Me?" "You can serve Me in the light; do you love me enough to serve Me in the darkness?" There will be other tests, but this is often the first great one, and many men never get beyond it, because they yield to the temptation of thinking they are wicked because they aren't *enjoying* their prayers. A girl might just as well think she is thoroughly wicked because when voluntarily scrubbing out a room for her mother, who is tired, she is conscious all the time of not being fond of scrubbing!

(*f*) There is a great danger that we should think too much of what *we* are doing for *God*, and not enough about what God is doing for *us*. God is the Master Workman, working at your soul and mine, trying to make them what He would have them be. All the various events which

touch our lives with joy or with sorrow or with weariness or with pain, or with the great love that God sometimes gives between man and woman or between man and man—all these are instruments which He is using to shape our souls with. All the time He is cutting away and rubbing away and washing away at our souls, working down through the rubbish and selfishness which covers and spoils them, until at last He will bring to light in us clear and bright and shining, the one piece of true gold hidden under all the rest, the image of Himself in which He made man at the first. Trust the Jesus who saved you to know what He is doing with you and me, and don't let us fuss and talk and whine overmuch about what we are doing for Him, and about our troubles and pains.

(*g*) By following the advice in the last section you will be forgetting self, and so deepening your humility. If God were to give you to-day all the spiritual graces you ask for, you might in a few days lose your soul for ever through pride. It is only as the vessel of humility deepens that God can pour into it His most precious and abundant gifts.

(*h*) Important operations on our souls, as is the case with important operations on our bodies, seem to be often performed by the Master Surgeon while He keeps us almost as it were anæsthetized. This happens sometimes with regard to the growing in us of so real a love for God that we would make any sacrifice whatever for Him. We ask continually for this, and when one day comes some great sacrifice to be made for Him, we find that we make it, and then we know that He has at last given to us the gift we had begged for so long.

(*i*) If our souls are to be the brides of Christ, there may well be ornaments and a bridal frock at the beginning, followed by plenty of hard work and comradeship, but in plain clothes, afterwards. Love will grow as the years pass, and the consummation of spiritual love is almost never finally reached in this life.

BERNARD CLEMENTS, O.S.B.

SOME BOOKS RECOMMENDED

Meditation and Mental Prayer. W. L. Knox. (A great deal of what is said about Meditation in this paper is taken from this book, which is extraordinarily useful and clear for beginners.) (Philip Allan, 3s. 6d.)
The Ways of Mental Prayer. Lehodey. (Gill, Dublin, 5s.)
The Science of Prayer. Ludovic de Besse. (B. O. and W., 6s.)
The Ordinary Ways of the Spiritual Life. Farges. (B. O. and W., 10s. 6d.)
Précis de Théologie Ascétique et Mystique. Tanquerey. (Desclée et Cie, about 5s.)
An Introduction to the Mystical Life. Lejeune. (B. O. and W., 3s. 6d.)
Delight in the Lord. Considine. (B. O. and W., 1s., or leather, 3s. 6d., worth at least a guinea.)
The Interior Life, and other addresses. Congreve. (Mowbray.)
Christian Life, A Response. Congreve. (Longmans.)
Le Christ Vie de l'Ame. Marmion. (Abbaye de Maredsous, Belgium). (Also published in English translation.)
Abandonment to Divine Providence. de Caussade. (B. O. and W., 4s. 6d., or Herder, about 10s. The original French costs about half this.)
The Imitation of Christ.
Introduction to Devout Life. St. Francis de Sales.
The Cloud of Unknowing.
The Scale of Perfection. Hilton.

(All these four in the Orchard Books, B. O. and W., 5s. each.)

St. John of the Cross. Ascent of Mt. Carmel. (Baker, London.)
Light on Mt. Carmel. Ludovic de Besse. (B. O. and W., 2s. 6d.)

For suggestions for Meditation and Mental Prayer.

In the Face of Jesus Christ. Jenks. (This contains much invaluable material, but the Meditation assigned for one day can often be profitably spread over a week. Remember that the object of Meditation is never that we should get through so many points which have been set before us, but that our affections with renewed strength should leap up to God.) (Longmans, 9s.)

STUDIES IN TEXTS

(*a*) Gal. vi. 14: "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."

It would be easy to understand if St. Paul said that he gloried in His *death*; but why the shameful *instrument* of death? A follower of Socrates might boast in the fact that he was put to death; but he would not boast in the hemlock. To understand St. Paul, it is necessary to review briefly his doctrine of Christ's death, which has often been done, but needs to be often repeated.

His line of thought started with sore and terrible experience. Man is opposed by gigantic powers of evil, devilish forces which hold him in degrading slavery, and are steadily killing him. There is very little in St. Paul about Christ's death being a sacrificial propitiation for sin. What is distinctive in his teaching is the way in which God, by His Son whom He sent, rescued man from this appalling condition. Arrayed against him, in the first place, was *Sin*. St. Paul thinks of Sin (not "sins," separate sinful acts) with a huge capital S, a vast, awful power which is personified as though it were some terrible demon or despot. But "Him who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf" (2 Cor. v. 21). By identifying Himself with us to the uttermost—a price which God, in His love, was willing to pay—Christ placed Himself, so to speak, under the power, the deadly grip, of the tyrant. That mass of human sin brought Him to His death. Nevertheless, by that very death He burst free—inseparably united with mankind—from Sin's tyranny. Sin died with Him, but could not rise with Him. He left it behind Him, dead for ever. And because of His oneness with human life, all mankind with Him have burst free and left Sin behind dead.

Law, in its true nature, was "holy and just and good" (Rom. vii. 12), and "spiritual" (v. 14). But it "worketh wrath" (iv. 15) because no man can keep it quite perfectly. Christ identified Himself with man groaning under the yoke of the Law. "God sent forth His Son born of a woman, born under the Law, that He might redeem them that were under the Law" (Gal. iv. 4). Then, one with them under the Law, He was crucified . . . "having wiped out the handwriting in ordinances which was against us, and took it from our midst, nailing it to His cross" (Col. ii. 14). When He was nailed there, Law was nailed; but by death He (and we with Him) burst free and left it behind.

Law involves a *Curse*, just because no one can keep it (Gal. iii. 10). But "Christ redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, by becoming a Curse on our behalf" (v. 13). It is just the same: Christ identified Himself with man under the Curse, and then burst free by death, so that He (and we with Him) killed the Curse.

Sin tyrannizes over man by another instrument—the *Flesh*. The "body" is meant to be "the temple of the Holy Spirit"; "glorify God in your body" (1 Cor. vi. 19*f*.). But when it is the body, not as it ought

to be, but as it very often is, it means the same as the "flesh": it is the "body of death" (Rom. vi. 6, vii. 4; *cf.* viii. 10), and must be kept in control with the sternest discipline (1 Cor. ix. 27). But "flesh" is the more usual word for what we should call the animal instincts craving for satisfaction. And the method of salvation is exactly the same: "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh (flesh dwelt in and made use of by sin)." His flesh, instincts, temptations, were as ours; He identified Himself with us. His flesh was then crucified, and by death He burst free from it, leaving it behind, and by His resurrection He entered into a condition of power, according to the Spirit of holiness (Rom. i. 4).

Another personification of Sin was connected with *Astrology*. The forces of Nature, and especially the influences of the heavenly bodies, were so overpowering and mysterious that they were worshipped by pagans as divine. The true Jew, of course, thought of these Nature-deities with abhorrence; and St. Paul once calls them demons (1 Cor. x. 20 *f.*). But he mostly connected them with the Jewish belief in fallen angels. These fallen angels exercised a secret and malign influence, which was connected very vaguely with the air and the heavens, where the heavenly bodies seemed to work. Their Chief was "the Prince of the authority of the air" (Eph. ii. 2), and they are in general "principalities and powers, the world-rulers of this darkness, the spiritual things of wickedness in the heavenlies" (vi. 12), and against them we have to "wrestle." St. Paul calls them also "authorities," "thrones," "lordships," but most often "angels." How could Christ deliver men from this awful, occult, world-wide dominion? As before, He came under the domination of these powers by identifying Himself with man. And they appeared to triumph because they ("the rulers of this age") brought Him to His cross. But if they had known who He was, they would not have done so, because they were working their own ruin (1 Cor. ii. 6, 8). When He was crucified, man's sin which resulted from their domination was crucified with Him; but by the act of dying He "stripped off the principalities and authorities, and openly made a show of them, triumphing over them on the cross" (Col. ii. 15).

But St. Paul went further, and connected them with Law and its slavery. It was a Jewish tradition that it was through angels that the Law was given at Sinai (Acts vii. 53, Gal. iii. 19, Heb. ii. 2), but he makes this mean bad angels. And he makes this connexion with the Law by the use of a complex term, the "elements." The Greek word *stoicheia* might mean only the elementary, non-Christian, commands of the Law (Gal. iv. 3, 9), but the same word is used in Col. ii. 8, 20, where the Gnostic worship of evil angelic powers is attacked. We still speak popularly of earth, air, fire, and water, as "elements," but in the ancient world all the terrific, unseen powers could be so described. And because they gave the Law, and thereby enslaved man, when Law died on the cross, they also died.

All this helps to explain Phil. ii. 8: "And having been found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient even under death, *and that the death of the cross*. Wherefore also God highly exalted Him," etc. For the complete Self-identification with man, the extremity of shame and pain had to be reached. He that ascended is the same as He that descended first. So that St. Paul could glory, not only in Christ's death, but in the shame and pain of the instrument of death.

A. H. McNeile.

(*b*) Matt. xix. 11, 12.

God's original command was that man and wife should live together permanently. Moses, it is true, allowed a divorce in some cases, but Christ said it ought not to be so, and marriages should be permanent, the only exception being in regard to fornication. The disciples then say: "If this is the case, and a man who marries a woman is bound to live with her always (though they may not suit each other), it is better not to marry."

"*But he said unto them: All men cannot receive this saying, but they to whom it is given. For there are eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb, and there are eunuchs, which were made eunuchs by men, and there are eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it*" (verses 11-12, R.V.).

I do not think there can be any doubt that the three classes of eunuchs must all be *literally* so. The idea, advocated by many (*e.g.*, in Gore's *New Commentary*, 1928), that the first two are literally so, but the third in only a figurative sense, including men like St. John the Baptist and St. Peter, seems to me to be quite untenable. But it does not follow that the last words *He that is able to receive it*, etc., need refer to the eunuchs. They may very well refer to the *saying* in v. 11; thus—all men cannot receive this *saying*. . . . He that is able to receive *it* (the saying), let him receive it. The passage about the eunuchs would then be a sort of parenthesis; and it would remove the difficulty as to Christ's *recommending* persons to make themselves eunuchs.

But what is the *saying* referred to? The usual answer is that it is the previous saying of the disciples, when the passage would mean—All men cannot receive this saying (*i.e.*, the saying of the disciples, and remain unmarried), for there are eunuchs, some made by nature, some by man, and some self-made from religious motives. He that is able to receive it (*i.e.*, to remain unmarried), let him receive it.

There does not seem to be any difficulty in this view, as celibacy is commended in other places, especially by St. Paul. But I do not think it can be the meaning here; since it makes the argument so very illogical: thus—all men cannot receive this saying, and remain unmarried, *for*—and then instead of giving examples of men who cannot receive it, we have examples of men who can, and do receive it, eunuchs! It is like saying: "All men cannot abstain from drink, for some are teetotallers!"

A much better explanation, first suggested to me by the Rev. P. Houghton (see *Chichester Diocesan Gazette*, August, 1917), is: *All* men cannot receive this *saying* (not the previous remark of the disciples in v. 10, but the great saying of God, in vv. 4-6, that marriage is permanent, and a married man must always live with his wife), for some are eunuchs and cannot marry at all. He, however, who is able to receive it (who is willing to marry, on condition that it is to be permanent), let him do so. This makes the argument perfectly plain and simple.

And the difficulty in understanding the words, *this saying*, as not referring to the remark of the disciples is greatly lessened by the fact that the word *this* is omitted in some of the best MSS., and it does not occur in Westcott and Hort's *Greek Testament*, though it is in the R.V. And if we omit it, *the saying*, which all men cannot receive, would more naturally refer to the great saying of God, that marriage is *permanent*, rather than to such an incidental and casual remark as that of the disciples, which was only heard by those present.

W. H. TURTON.

REVIEWS

THE CHRIST OF APOSTOLIC FAITH. By H. T. Andrews, D.D. With a Memoir of the Author by Jessie Forsyth Andrews. Nisbet. 5s.

The late Professor Andrews was son-in-law of Principal Forsyth. They were both Congregationalist theologians of a definitely orthodox type, with decided sympathies in a Catholic direction. Professor Andrews attracted considerable notice some time ago by a remarkable essay on the Sacramentalism of St. Paul, which was incorporated in Principal Forsyth's book on the Church and the Sacraments. It contained an instructive account of the way in which recent German criticism on Pauline Theology had come to recognize the Apostle's Catholic tendencies. Nor did it hesitate to raise quite frankly the bearing of this conclusion on a Protestantism which professed to base itself upon St. Paul.

Professor Andrews, had he lived, was to have written a book on the Person of Christ in Nisbet's Library of Constructive Theology. The present book on the Christ of the Apostolic Faith is a fragment of the larger work, and all that he was able to complete. It is an excellent study, on critical lines, relying largely on psychological methods and the value of experience, with much insight into modern tendencies and limitations.

The fact confronting the student of the Apostolic writings is that the Christian religion started on its career with a very simple Creed—namely, that Jesus is the Messiah; but that before a single generation had passed away Jesus was placed by the side of God and of the Holy Spirit. That is what is found in the conclusion of 2 Corinthians. The problem is to account for this amazing development.

In Professor Andrews' opinion, the term Messiah was indefinite. Haziness may be a common characteristic of modern religion, but the Church of the Apostolic age could not have secured its triumph with a creed of dubious meaning capable of contradictory interpretations. Moreover, the term Messiah is Jewish, and was almost unintelligible to the Greek world.

There was, however, fortunately an alternative expression already in use, namely—the term "Lord." These two terms coalesced in the common formula which came into general use during the first Christian generation. The formula "our Lord Jesus Christ" is "a condensed expression signifiying Jesus who is the Jews' Messiah and the Gentiles' Lord, or more simply, perhaps, Jesus who is both our Messiah and our Lord."

Professor Andrews seems confusing here. The first meaning regards the two terms as equivalents; the latter regards the term Lord as supplementary to the other. Yet he adds that "the combination suggests that both terms ought to be construed in the highest sense. The one guarantees the other and makes it more difficult for the lower interpretation to be placed upon it." Accordingly, he understands St. Peter's pronouncement at Whitsuntide, "Him God made both Lord and Christ," as clearly implying that Jesus was raised by God to the rank of Divinity. That is to say, we have here a quasi-Adoptionist interpretation of Jesus.

Here, then, the central problem is faced. How was it that within thirty years the Christian religion reached the faith which placed Jesus in the same rank with God and the Holy Spirit? This is the battleground of modern criticism.

The Whitsuntide announcement describes Jesus as "having been exalted to the right hand of God." There is first in primitive Christendom the universal experience that Jesus Christ had altered the balance of forces in the moral life and made virtue and goodness attainable in a way that had never been possible before. There is, secondly, a mystical element—a sense of fellowship between St. Paul and the living eternal Christ. There is the formula "in Christ."

The Pauline utterances are not to be taken as metaphorical. They are not to be accounted for as a mere pre-Christian tendency. They cannot be dissociated from the religious experience which came to St. Paul on the day of his conversion. "The eternal Christ was as great a reality to him as the historical Jesus had been to the first disciples among the hills of Galilee. And the soul of Paul and the Spirit of Christ became so interfused and interpenetrated with each other that he came to feel that his own personality was lost in that of Christ, and that his life was hid with Christ in God."

Now the question is, why should this Christ-mysticism have been substituted for a God-mysticism? That shows the tremendous place Jesus had come to hold in St. Paul's esteem. Jesus must already have attained the value of God for St. Paul before this substitution could be possible.

This experience of St. Paul has been vindicated by the similar experiences of the Christian mystics throughout the centuries. If the validity of this experience is granted, the Pauline language at the close of 2 Corinthians follows as a natural and inevitable result.

If the first generation of Christians carried the faith from the first single Creed, "Jesus is the Messiah," to the Benediction in which Jesus is given rank with God and the Holy Spirit in

the same formula, it did not face, except by occasional suggestion, the intellectual problems which the Benediction raised. "Christian experience could not rest content with a theory which attributed only a minimum of Divinity to Jesus. It claimed for Him not a minimum, but a maximum of Divinity. The first great Christological controversy was fought out on the issue whether the highest categories of thought, or something less than the highest, were to be used in the interpretation of Christ. And when that issue was once raised Christian experience rejected, as it always has rejected through all the Christological debates in the history of the Church, the lower alternative."

Even in the earlier period there are clear indications that St. Paul was feeling his way towards a philosophical interpretation of Christ. That can be illustrated in 1 Cor. xv. 47, where Christ is the pre-existent heavenly man. A later illustration is Colossians i. 15-17 ("by Him were all things created"). Professor Andrews truly says: "The significance of this passage cannot be exaggerated. Only thirty years have passed since Jesus of Nazareth was sentenced to death and suffered under Pontius Pilate; and here, in the Colossian statement, is the Apostle Paul, by a daring leap of the imagination, declaring that Jesus was God's agent in the creation of the universe of men and angels and things, that He is the sustaining power that maintains the life of the universe, and that He is the goal towards which the universe is working its way."

As Professor Andrews very pertinently says—Granted that all the necessary categories and theological formulæ were lying ready to hand in the storehouses of the Jewish, Greek and Oriental cults of the time, why was it that Jesus was selected for this honour and dignity? Was it easy for Jews, with their passionate devotion to monotheism, in spite of their Messianic theology and their Wisdom teaching, to endue Jesus with the attributes of Deity?

The conclusion to which all Christian experiences of every age converge is that none but the highest terms and categories of thought are adequate for the true interpretation of Jesus Christ.

One can only express regret, which other readers will share, that the writer did not live to complete on a large scale these admirable studies.

W. J. SPARROW-SIMPSON.

WOLSEY. By A. F. Pollard. Longmans. 21s.

The want of a sound, comprehensive, and up-to-date biography of Thomas Wolsey has long been painfully evident to

students of the Tudor period; and at the same time it may be stated that no historian living is better qualified to supply it than Professor Pollard. Of his qualifications this volume, based on his Ford Lectures (1928), is sufficiently eloquent. It is a monument of industry and erudition: indeed, one could hardly credit that a single individual, however deeply versed in Tudor history, could have accomplished all the research necessary for its preparation, were it not for the absence from the preface of any personal acknowledgments, except to the author's wife. It represents, in fact, a remarkable achievement of English historical scholarship.

At first sight, as must be admitted, it is unnecessarily repellent. The little joke about underwear in the first paragraph might have been spared: what passes for wit in a university lecture-room is sometimes mistaken for flippancy on the printed page. Similarly the description (p. 10) of the future Defender of the Faith as "the gay and giddy heir of both the roses" might have been otherwise expressed. At the same time, the massed array of footnotes is both forbidding and distracting: in the entire volume there are only two full pages without a footnote, and some of the notes are very lengthy, and a few, while illustrating the range and the exuberance of the author's knowledge, are slightly irrelevant. But these initial discouragements are soon overcome, and the substantial merits of the book are readily apparent.

The most important feature is the review of Wolsey's foreign policy. By the truth or falsehood of the author's theory regarding it, this book must stand or fall. Of the two, it seems more probable that it will stand. The conventional theory is that Wolsey's policy was inspired by a careful calculation of the balance of power (which he has even been held to have discovered). Alternatively it has been suggested that he was consistently pro-French. Dr. Pollard shows that both theories are disproved by his proposal to the Emperor of a joint invasion in 1525 to complete the ruin and to effect the partition of France, and argues that "he consistently followed a papal policy and was led by personal interests in the same direction. . . . Every change in his attitude towards other European powers coincided with a change in the policy of the papal curia." For the Pope's legate *a latere* in England the pivot of foreign policy was inevitably Rome. "England embarked on war at the invitation of Julius II., made peace at the behest of Leo X., attempted by the Milan expedition to relieve the papacy of the embarrassment of France, renewed the war in the footsteps of Leo X. in 1521, began to withdraw with Clement VII. in 1524, endeavoured to rescue the holy see from the clutches of

Charles V., and suffered with the Pope from their common eclipse at Barcelona and Cambrai."

Dr. Pollard also throws much new light on Wolsey's personal ambitions, his ecclesiastical policy, and the nature and implications of his office as quasi-permanent *legatus a latere* in England. "Never had Roman jurisdiction been brought home to Englishmen so effectively and so intensively as it was by Wolsey. . . . All sections of society felt the difference between a papal jurisdiction, indirect, remote, and rarely exerted at Rome, and the same jurisdiction deputed to a legate who could supplement the coercive defects of courts christian out of the plenitude of his power in chancery, in the council, and in the star chamber." He established "an unprecedented ecclesiastical despotism in England," a despotism resented by the English hierarchy, by the inferior clergy, by the laity, and by the Pope. "But for Wolsey, the breach with Rome would have been longer deferred and the reformation would assuredly have taken a different course; it was he who converted the hierarchy in England to at least acquiescence in a change from what it had undergone at the hands of the only man who had, uncontrolled by parliament, combined despotic authority in the state with the sole control of the English Church. He always drove furiously; and as legate *a latere* of the Pope he rode papal jurisdiction in England to its death." In this sense, and in this sense alone, he may be regarded as "*l'auteur du schisme*." On the significance of his indictment and conviction in a secular court (King's Bench) Professor Pollard is peculiarly impressive: it marked the decisive victory of the *regnum* over the *sacerdotium*. For the great Cardinal, though he might concentrate in his hands both secular and ecclesiastical authority to a degree unprecedented, remained the mere servant, although by far the greatest servant, of the Crown: his power, however vast, rested upon the slight and treacherous foundation of his master's favour: and Henry, when resolved upon his overthrow, accomplished it without effort and became, almost automatically, his sole legatee.

"Few men have ever exerted greater authority than Wolsey, and still fewer have afforded so striking an illustration of the demoralising effects of irresponsible power": such is Dr. Pollard's final verdict on his career and on his character. The Cardinal-legate emerges from these pages as a titanic figure, a man of gigantic strength, but of defective vision: his real weakness was that he was absorbed almost exclusively in the accumulation of power, and gave too little thought to its immediate and proper application. He accumulated power simply in order to make himself powerful, and he made himself powerful in order to secure his elevation to the papacy: but, by the failure of his

spirited foreign policy, the Emperor had acquired an effective veto upon his election. For Wolsey, all roads led to Rome; but he was fated never to attain his destination.

Upon these, and upon other topics of a more strictly constitutional interest—such as the composition of Parliament, the functions of Chancery, or the development of the Star Chamber—this book is a mine of information, much of it embedded in the footnotes. It is therefore the more to be regretted that problems of such obvious importance as Wolsey's relations with Cromwell and his dissolutions of monastic houses are less adequately handled. "I let passe," wrote Barlow in his *Dialoge of the Lutheran Faccions* (which Dr. Pollard seems to have overlooked), "I let passe my lord cardinals acte in pullynge down & suppressīg of religious places, our lord assoile his soule. I wyll wrestle with no soules: he knoweth by this tyme whyther he dyd well or euyll. But thys dare I be bolde to saye, that the countreis [*i.e.* counties] where they stode, fynde suche lacke of them: that they would he had let them stand. And thinke you then that there wold be no lack founden, if ye remanaunt were so served to?" A few scattered allusions, of which the footnotes to pp. 182 and 203 are the most helpful, seem insufficient in view of the importance of the precedent established; while the author's own reference (p. 325 *n.*) to pp. 202-4 is little to the point. Nor does the existence of Professor Merriman's standard work on Cromwell, to which the reader is occasionally recommended, wholly relieve the author of a life of Wolsey from discussing the association, in all its stages, of the lion with his jackal.

A few minor points call for correction, or at least for reconsideration. To apply to Wolsey's anti-aristocratic policy the term "anti-feudal" is surely an anachronism, while to describe the Great Rebellion as "civil war between the king and his people" (p. 219) is wickedly misleading. The sense in which Professor Pollard understands the word "Establishment" (p. 317-8) is too limited to be true: here, as in general throughout the book, the purely legal aspect of a given problem attains an undue predominance. Occasionally terms requiring explanation are pressed into service too long before that explanation is supplied: as "counsel" (p. 100, *vide* p. 105 and *n.*), and "legate *a latere*" (p. 165, *vide* pp. 170-1). It is strange to find the author describing Wolsey as "Prime Minister" while admitting on the same page that the use of such a title "involves confusion" and that it is in fact inapplicable to him (p. 99). Furthermore, he seems unable to decide whether to call Wolsey's commission a "legacy" (which is confusing) or a "legateship" (which is cacophonous), and consequently employs both words with total inconsistency. Nor is he quite resolved whether

or not the fact that Wolsey was no persecutor (by comparison with More) is really to his credit (p. 208; *cf.* p. 209). That Dr. Pollard's prose style is not flawless the foregoing extracts may serve to indicate. Finally, it may be suggested that the addition of a chronological table at the end of the book would have been extremely serviceable.

Such detailed criticisms are justified only by the value and importance of this biography. It is a book that is most cordially welcome. Professor Pollard has made a real contribution to our knowledge: he has approached his subject from many angles, and his life of Wolsey, like his more celebrated life of Wolsey's master, is learned, luminous, and eminently readable: more than that, it is, and must long remain, quite indispensable to any competent acquaintance with the background of the English Reformation.

CHARLES SMYTH.

NOTICES

A LITERARY HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN FRANCE FROM THE WARS OF RELIGION DOWN TO OUR OWN TIMES. By Henri Bremond. Vol. I.: Devout Humanism. Translated by K. L. Montgomery. S.P.C.K. 16s.

It is barely twelve years since the Abbé Bremond published the first instalment of his great work, and he has, thanks to incredible industry and determination, carried it to eight imposing volumes and down to Bourdaloue. No theologian, historian, psychologist, or lover of literature but will congratulate him on what he has already accomplished, and wish him strength and health to fulfil his noble intention. What that is can best be stated in his own words: "Il y a deux façons de concevoir l'histoire de la littérature religieuse. Enumérer les principaux écrivains religieux de telle période ou de tel pays, décrire leurs œuvres, discuter l'originalité de chacun d'eux, son mérite littéraire ou philosophique, c'est une première méthode. . . . Newman chez les Anglais et Sainte-Beuve chez nous ont mis en honneur une autre méthode, morale ou religieuse plus encore que littéraire . . . c'est avant tout la religion elle-même, son influence profonde, son histoire, son progrès ou ses éclipses qui les intéresse. Leur objet direct est de pénétrer le secret religieux des âmes . . . et les nuances particulières d'un pareil secret. Ces poètes chrétiens, ces prédicateurs, ces auteurs dévots, quelle était leur vie intime, leur prière vraie, quelle enfin leur expérience personnelle des réalités dont ils parlent, voilà ce que l'on voudrait avant tout connaître. De ces deux méthodes, j'ai choisi la seconde, et c'est là ce que veut indiquer le titre qu'on vient de lire: *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France.*" It is a *literary* history—the story of religious sentiment expressed in literature, and especially in the printed book; and it is a *religious* history inasmuch as the æsthetic value of the writers is kept subordinate to their piety. This double character of the subject is reflected in the treatment. On the one hand there is the true spirit of devotion, on the other a rare felicity of presentation. I said long ago and elsewhere (*Journal of*

Theological Studies for October, 1921, p. 89) that M. Bremond's work deserves a place beside Sainte-Beuve's *Port Royal* for its portraiture, and beside Baron Fr. von Hügel's *Mystical Element in Religion* for its psychology, and the intervening years and successive volumes have only confirmed me in my opinion. Now S.P.C.K. has undertaken to introduce this admirable work to English readers, and the first volume, *Devout Humanism*, is before me. The meaning of this title is the *joie de vivre* of the sixteenth century sealed for sacred use and practical application by St. François de Sales and his disciples. The story begins, after a chapter on Christian Humanism of the Renaissance, the stuff out of which Devout Humanism was wrought, with the Jesuit, Louis Richeome, born a generation before St. Francis and showing him the way, and it ends with the Capuchin, Yves de Paris, who died fifty years after the saint, of whose teaching and spirit he is the very embodiment. He fitly ushers us into the enchanted garden of mysticism, of which M. Bremond treats in his succeeding volumes (*L'Invasion Mystique, La Conquête Mystique*).

The manner in which the translation of Vol. I. has been carried out by K. L. Montgomery seems to me quite admirable, and augurs well for the rest. It stands the double test to which this kind of work must be subjected. It is accurate; and it reads like an original work. No doubt it is impossible to catch and convey the full flavour of Bremond's exquisite prose, but many an English reader whose French is shaky or rusty will bless the skill and scholarship which have brought within his reach what is at once a piece of real literature of the highest order and an example of profound piety.

H. F. STEWART.

AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH. A Study of Principles. By T. A. Lacey, D.D. Mowbray. 3s. 6d.

The subject of Authority in the Church is one of somewhat acute interest at the present time in Anglican circles, and it confronts the Church of England both in relation to the State and in relation to its own members. Canon Lacey has written a small volume of great value as a study of principles, avoiding controversial details. A good deal of confused thinking exists about the whole subject in many quarters, and Dr. Lacey's contribution ought to prove of value in clarifying the issues at stake. The author rightly commences with the meaning of words, and shows the two senses in which the term authority is used and the confusion resulting from this. The Latin term *auctoritas* means moral weightiness, and this primary sense must be carefully distinguished from the other sense in which all modern languages derived from Latin speak of Authority, meaning by the term Legal Power.

Many of our current debates would be considerably helped if this distinction between moral authority and legal authority were kept clear, especially when the discussion turns upon authority in a Church in which both kinds of authority are to be found.

Dr. Lacey further clears the ground by defining the term "church," and reminding us that it is idle to speak of authority in connection with the Church if by the latter term we mean something which is invisible. This leads, in Chapter II., to a rapid survey of origins and an exact description of what the Christian Church was at the beginning—viz., a continuation of the Chosen People, the Israel of God under changed conditions and a new covenant. Chapter III. contains an illuminating treatment of the meaning of Catholic consent. Chapter IV. deals with

Administrative Authority, leading, in Chapter V., to a discussion of the Episcopate, and the conclusion that the Apostolate is continued in the existing Episcopate as the expanding foundation of the extending Church. Hence the existing bishops have, and can execute, the mission committed to the Twelve. What limits, then, are set to the exercise of their authority? An answer is found in Chapter VI., which, because it is the work of one who justly claims to be not polemically minded, must not be polemically interpreted. In Chapter VII. the vexed question of Discipline is wisely handled, and Canon Lacey allows himself the luxury of a final chapter on things in general with an omnibus title of "Achievement and Failure."

It would be difficult to find so much concentrated and mature wisdom on a difficult theme in so small a volume, and we hope it may gain a wide reading.

H. M. RELTON.

MIRRORS OF THE HOLY. By Lucy Menzies. Mowbray. 12s. 6d.

This book makes no extravagant claims; to quote the introduction—it "aims at showing in a simple way what sanctity really is." Within its limits it is interesting, but the ground it covers is by no means untrodden, as the author herself acknowledges, and no new light is cast upon the ten women saints who form its subject.

The volume may prove useful as an introduction to the more serious and permanent works of Miss Underhill and Baron von Hügel, for, the style flowing smoothly, it is easy to read and makes no demands upon the reader. But we are compelled to classify it as one of those books which, though they make attractive gifts and pleasant reading for a leisure hour, can find no place upon the shelf where the student keeps the more valuable and important contributions to the literature of mysticism and sanctity.

OLGA LEVERTOFF.

A BIBLICAL THOROUGHFARE. By the Rt. Rev. N. S. Talbot, D.D., Bishop of Pretoria. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

The plain man's way through the Bible is described in this book—obviously a labour of love, from the dedication at the beginning to the vision of consolation on the final page—with all the accustomed clarity, picturesqueness, and downright earnestness of the Bishop of Pretoria. Few who read it will escape the infection of the author's enthusiasm, and none but the blind can possibly go astray if they follow the guidance that is given. Other men would have treated certain sections of the way in a different proportion; some would conceivably challenge in places the order of presentation that is here adopted; but all would agree that for freshness and interest and for real helpfulness to the readers in view, the Bishop's work easily surpasses most of the many books that summarize in popular form the results of modern biblical scholarship.

O. HARDMAN.

THE OLD CHURCH IN THE NEW DOMINION. By C. W. Vernon. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. paper, 4s. 6d. cloth.

In this book we have a full and interesting history of the "Anglican" Church in Canada—a country rich in possibilities and problems, nearly as large as Europe, with a mixed population very unevenly distributed. Dr. Vernon's survey begins with the work of the Church, helped by S.P.G. and S.P.C.K., in Nova Scotia, which became a British province in 1710.

The second chapter describes the coming of the "United Empire Loyalists," American colonists who were driven from their homes after the Revolution, and came in large numbers to Canada proper, which had been British since A.D. 1759. The first Canadian bishop, Dr. Charles Inglis, was one of these refugees. The remaining chapters recount the history of the establishment of episcopacy in Canada, the work in the great spaces of Western Canada, and the consolidation of the Church. The concluding chapter is of special interest. It relates how the Church of the Dominion "became a great autonomous national Church, bound by its doctrine and ministry to the Mother-Church and the historic see of Canterbury, but free and self-governing" (p. 169). The Church has now its Primate, its General Synod, its Missionary Society (not societies), its Council for Social Service, its pension scheme, its Universities and Theological Colleges, its Revised Prayer Book and its Hymn Book. Dr. Vernon's history is well written and well illustrated, and published at a price which should ensure for it a wide circulation among Churchpeople at home, to whom, one suspects, most of the facts it relates will be new, and certainly should be deeply interesting. It would have added to the value of the book if something had been said about the present difficulties of the Church in Western Canada, where since the war there has been a serious shortage of clergy (see *The Call from Our Own People Overseas*, pp. 47-61). H. W. FULFORD.

THE ORDEAL OF THIS GENERATION: THE WAR, THE LEAGUE, AND THE FUTURE. By Sir Gilbert Murray. Allen and Unwin. 4s. 6d.

How happy should we be if all our statesmen—that small band of practised administrators, between whom it is the occasional privilege of electors to discern—had the wise outlook and the well-furnished background of Sir Gilbert Murray! Macaulay once asserted that a young man is no judge of such a writer as Thucydides. "I have now been reading him," he says, "with a mind accustomed to historical researches and to political affairs, and I am astonished at my own former blindness, and at his greatness." Sir Gilbert Murray is a notable example of a man who really brings to bear on the study of politics a profound knowledge of history, an acute understanding of human motive, and a resolute idealism. If party politics could be for once forgotten, and Sir Gilbert Murray invited to become Foreign Secretary, the ship of state would have faith at the prow and knowledge at the helm. In the meantime, he has written a most interesting and valuable book. His first chapter contains a careful discussion of the meaning of such words as peace, strife, and war, and of the real reasons why we must seek peace and ensue it. He then examines the Victorian dogma of the independent sovereign state, and finds it the main flaw in the accepted political and social organization of Europe. The remainder of the book is a lucid and persuasive account of the way in which the principles of the Covenant warrant a belief that, if the League is maintained, the Lord will give peace in our time. He does not overlook the existence of hard problems, both within and without the Covenant, and he devotes a whole chapter to the special problems of the British Empire in relation to the League. But his treatment of it all is so sane and so fair, that he will edify and enlighten even where he does not quite convince. S. C. CARPENTER.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD. GUILDFORD AND ESHER